

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1855.

---

ART. I. — THE PROVINCE AND FUNCTIONS OF FAITH.

[A Duddleian Lecture delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, on Wednesday, May 9, 1855, by WILLIAM P. LUNT.]

MORE than a century ago, Paul Dudley, a man of considerable note in his day, who stood well with his sovereign, and more or less so with the people of the Province of Massachusetts, founded a yearly Lecture, to be delivered within the walls of Harvard College. He named four topics, which were to be discoursed in order. The first Lecture was to be for "the proving, explaining, and proper use and improvement of the principles of Natural Religion, as it is commonly called and understood by divines and learned men." This is the subject assigned to the lecturer of the present year, and will suggest the remarks to be offered on this occasion.

The aim of the present discourse will be to state the peculiar office of faith; to discriminate it from reason; to vindicate its distinct character, and its proper claims, from the morbid jealousy which interferes with its free action; to show, as I may be able, that in Natural Religion, on the ground of Philosophy, this part of our human nature has a particular and express function assigned to it, which reason cannot and was not designed

to execute, and in the right discharge of which it can no more be aided by the reasoning faculty, than, in the physical economy, the appropriate function of the heart or of any other of the interior organs can be assisted by the hands, or the senses, or by the supervision and direction of the understanding. The processes which belong to the several organs of our animal framework go on without any need of our verifying, on scientific principles, the method, and without the necessity of our even understanding that method. The discourse will endeavor to show that it is so with the spiritual economy of man. Faith will execute the function for which it is specially fitted, without the aid of reason, and all the better if reason do not impertinently meddle with what is not its work.

In taking such a position, the speaker may seem to be assuming a responsibility not becoming a humble individual, who is too much honored in being invited to stand here on this occasion. But without wishing to fulfil the duties of the occasion by the statement of paradoxes, I have simply to say, that the chaotic condition of thought in our portion of the religious world suggests the view which it is proposed to present, under the main subject assigned to the lecturer of the present year. It only remains, therefore, for me, with deference to the intelligence that is to listen, and with still greater deference to the truth, to speak on, and to assume the responsibility.

And it must be confessed that the mind of our community, on the subject of morals and religion, is in a false position. We are attempting to accomplish, with one faculty, that which Revelation — and, what is more pertinent to the present discussion, that which Natural Religion — refers to another and distinct faculty and process. The attempt, however humble, to expose this error of method, may help to disentangle the confusion of thought into which we are running more and more.

“You cannot,” says the Divine Word, “by taking thought, add to your stature one cubit, or make one hair black or white.” And in like manner we may say: You cannot, by taking thought, by any logical or philosophical arguments which the discursive intellect can invent, add to the assurance or the practical efficiency of faith. You cannot, by the processes of mere reasoning, render



faith more available as a working principle in man's life. You only obstruct, enervate, paralyze its own energy, by trying to aid its action by logic. You cannot improve, by scholastic and sophistical inventions and applications, the natural method of the soul. In the theory of Natural Religion, no more than in revelation, does faith rely upon, or need the support of, the understanding. The methods, therefore, to which we are wedded by our Anglo-Protestant habits of thought, are a deviation from the method of nature; and the feeble, timid tone of modern faith results from this deviation.

The discourse will attempt to unfold and illustrate these thoughts.

Philosophical inquiries, to be pursued with much advantage, would seem to require a special adaptation of mind. Unhappily, it is a characteristic of the American mind to attempt all work. We have among us multitudes who honestly think a necessity is laid upon them to work with all their might upon the great problems of man's life and destiny. To believe without a reason is, to such minds, the unpardonable sin. They try to solve things which are insolvable. They use up all their stock of wit and argument in attempts to prove what is not intended to be proved, but rather, and simply to be received by faith. They exhaust their spirits, and, in some instances, the serene temper to which a believer is entitled, by a restless search into subjects which the Infinite Mind has reserved for his own privacy. The ancient myth of a tree of knowledge of good and evil, of which man was forbidden to eat in the beginning, is as full of instruction and warning now as ever. A glance at the contemporaneous intellectual and spiritual life of our period will suffice to bring before us many examples of those who have eaten of that fruit and found it fatal. It is a dictate, I think, not of Revelation merely, but of Natural Religion, that mankind must bring low the pride of intellect, and learn that faith is better than knowledge, or the poor attainments which are dignified with the name of knowledge. There are many things not knowable, which are yet believable; and it is a real acquisition in a person's moral culture, when he has reached the point of believing, without expecting or demanding proofs of what he believes.

The inclination shown by many to lay aside the religious notions which they received with ready mind in childhood, and to strive to penetrate, with the understanding, the mysteries of God and of life, to gauge the infinite, and to weigh with their heavy logic scales what is not ponderable, is not only vain and fruitless, but in the case of not a few minds is positively hurtful. The metaphysical analysis of the soul's conceptions can be pursued with profit, or even with safety, by only a small number; and even those who are qualified by natural endowments for such a delicate and perilous work are too often victims for the benefit of their fellow-men. They force their way, as pioneers of the advancing army of the race, into dark and unexplored paths, and survey the desert regions, where others who come after may dwell in security.

Religion in a concrete form is needed and can be appreciated and applied by all. The analysis of religious ideas, with a view to examine them separately, and to discover the infinitesimal elements of thought, and the mode of their combination, can be ventured on by a limited number only, and they are not to be envied in their work. It is quite easy to take to pieces the most complicated and nicely constructed piece of mechanism; but to reverse the process, and to put together again what has been so separated, and to reproduce the harmony and unity which have been disturbed, — this calls for the hand and the mind of a master, and not unfrequently the master's skill fails here.

But if it can be made clear that this perilous method of verifying our religious ideas need not be ventured upon; that reason is not in fact the umpire to settle the alternative of accepting or rejecting religion; that the soul has laws of its own, which, in a perfectly natural state of any human being, must and will be obeyed; that "spiritual things must be spiritually discerned"; that faith, in the most general sense of the word, that is, faith in supersensible realities, is the normal condition of the human mind; that faith, so far from itself being the result of reasoning, is an outgrowth and phenomenon of the soul, which precedes all reasoning, all deductive and inferential processes of thought, all reflection upon the contents of the mind; that faith is, in fact, an inward

sense or perception of superrational subjects, and therefore the proper "evidence of things not seen," — as truly so as the perceptions which we gain through the senses are an assurance, and the only and proper assurance, of the existence of outward objects; — then we base religion upon human nature, and we indicate a test for the essential truth of religion, which can be estimated and applied by all souls.

Consider, then, that faith, regarded as an original, innate constituent of the human nature, is a motive power, a spiritual force, which, we must conclude, is lodged within us, for purposes intimately connected with man's mission, development, offices, and destiny. To talk, therefore, of verifying and finding a justification for it, or for the exercise of it, is irrelevant. Faith is so much spiritual power given in charge to human beings, which they are first to gain a consciousness of, then to master, to regulate, and to apply to life's uses. And here, it would seem, is the province, and this the special work, of reason in relation to faith: not to originate the principle, not to adjudicate the high questions which belong to the soul, not to authorize the soul's operations; but merely to act the subordinate part of a regulator of its movements, in the application of the original power.

Steam is a physical motive-force. The intelligent ingenuity of man does not create the power, but only discovers it, and invents and constructs machinery, by the help of which to apply the power to practical purposes. In like manner, reason takes the original faith-power of the soul, and moulds it into distinct propositions and articles of belief, and constructs institutions that may have, from age to age, every variable degree of efficiency, and in this way makes the power more or less available for life's uses. Now all this subordinate work human reason is quite competent to execute; and accordingly Christ never sought to aid this work. He addressed himself exclusively and always to the soul, seeking, above all things else, to unfold to human consciousness the spiritual power that exists in the soul, leaving it to the progressive generations of the race to employ that power with all the freedom which their change of position, from age to age, might suggest and demand.

Moreover, I venture the proposition, that the reasoning

faculty is always, and is meant to be, sceptical. A sleepless, questioning, challenging jealousy is its special attribute in the economy of man. It was given to us, not to settle everything or anything by probability or demonstration, but to provoke incessant inquiry. And an inquiring temper involves doubt, and implies a state of perpetual dissatisfaction and unrest. Reason never settles anything absolutely, else there would be no room for the reason of the race to expand and gather clearness and strength with the lapse of time. I submit, the fact, that social institutions rest, in so great a degree, upon prescription, and that common-law sanctions are far more permanent and binding everywhere than any abstract theories of government, however elaborated, shows that reason never settles anything absolutely. To suppose that this busy, restless, progressive faculty can give, or was intended to give, permanent and reliable satisfaction to the soul, is to expect from it what its natural function does not qualify it to furnish. The understanding in man "is nothing if not critical."

The subject leads to the further remark, that the Christian Revelation teaches us much in reference to Natural Religion, not merely by marking out the limits of the native, unaided powers of the mind, but also, what is more pertinent to our purpose, by indicating the true method of inquiry.

Christianity assumes, and emphasizes the fact, that man has a soul or spiritual constitution; not a material sensorium merely, which could only make him a more perfect animal than the brutes; not a reasoning, discursive intellect merely; but a soul, having instincts, affections, hopes, spontaneous movements, and energies of its own. Christianity always addresses this part of man; never his senses, and never the reasoning faculty. It is a prominent peculiarity of Christ, regarded simply as a teacher, that he never argues any point, never speculates, never attempts to demonstrate or to prove, in any way similar to the inventions of the schools, what he affirms. He states, assumes, declares, bears witness, appeals to human consciousness. This is the way in which he deals with men. It may be said, that he did not reason with men, because he could furnish the evidence of miracles, which rendered all reasoning unne-



cessary. This circumstance, though we accept fully the fact of the Christian miracles, will not account for the phenomenon. If Christ taught with authority, and without seeking for the verifications of his doctrine which reason might claim to furnish, it shows plainly that he assumed, and that there is verily in human nature, some corresponding element that makes this method naturally proper, the only fit method indeed, and that if we will but take the same course in our attempts to awaken and impress the souls of our fellow-men, we shall be far more likely to succeed, than by employing the instruments of reasoning which the schools have invented. Christianity, therefore, I submit, gives the true theory of man, and indicates the right, the natural method of religious culture.

Moreover, it is worthy of remark that Christ, as a teacher, appeals invariably to faith, as an organic faculty of the soul. The function which faith discharges, in the theory of the soul's life, is not aided or sustained by proof, argument; and to such expedients Christ did not resort. He dealt with the principle differently, in a way of his own; and his method is one of the marked features of his religion, and evinces his divine penetration. He simply appealed to faith; made lucid and positive statements of truth; set before the keen appetite of the soul the bread of life; sowed the seed; never doubting that the seed would spring up, that the bread would be eaten, that the truth would be received. What now is implied in this method? Is it not, that there is a natural receptivity for moral and spiritual truth in the soul? The understanding, with its processes of deduction, inference, argumentation, of what sort soever, has no place or work here. It has its proper sphere and its peculiar function; but they are subordinate to the moral and spiritual intuitions of the soul. Keep it in its place. Do not call it up from its mere ministerial agencies and offices, to occupy the sovereign seat in the soul, by the side of God himself. There it will be only an intruder and a usurper.

The fact is certainly noticeable and noteworthy, that the Master of our faith (looking now at Christ simply as a Teacher, and leaving out of view the character which theology ascribes to him as a Divine Intelligence,



a part of God) never reasoned any matter with his hearers. "Verily I say unto you," is his style of address and indoctrination. The doctrine passed directly from the soul of the instructor to the souls of the taught. There were no gradations of approach; no logical steps from one to the other. "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" were his words. Any cavil at the word *judge* in this quotation will hardly suggest itself, because there are judgments of the conscience and of the soul, which are not the result of inference, but which are the spontaneous utterings of the interior nature, which are indeed necessitated by a law of moral and spiritual life, — *a priori* judgments, not which are born in us, but which we are so made, when we are born, that we cannot but acquire, unless indeed a moral and spiritual death supervenes.

Christianity overturned the whole philosophy of the world, not by meddling with philosophy itself, but by the simple spiritual facts which it recognized, by the faculties in man's nature which it addressed, by the new and natural method which it indicated, and by the bold yet obvious maxims which it assumed. It reversed the principles of previous thinkers. It took a new starting-point. Its line of departure was original, and it moved off from the common track elsewhither. One of its assumed maxims is that "faith is the evidence of things not seen"; that is, it verifies itself. Faith is an independent faculty in the soul of man, having its own laws, its peculiar mode of originating action, and of acting. So that to make it the result merely of a process of reasoning would be to degrade it, and not only that, but to alter the organic structure of our nature. It would be as though we should undertake to legitimate any conclusion of the discursive intellect by referring it to some one of our bodily appetites or senses. The soul does not reason. The soul judges, sees, believes, vaticinates, hopes, fears, adores. You cannot build a ladder of logical steps for reason to walk up step by step into heaven, in the same deliberate way as used to be represented in the Puritan Primer, where the good angels were depicted walking up and down on a broad stairway over the patriarch's head; and which was apt to suggest to the child's fancy to ask, why the blessed ones had not left their *wings* at home.

And again, in regard to some of the doctrines taught by Revealed Religion; — the doctrine of the Spirit, for example. Now the fact of the existence of a Great Spirit, a Supernal Intelligence, — and the related facts, that the spirit which is in man is intimately connected with that Holy Spirit, is enlightened by it, and that influences are continually proceeding from it to human minds, — were articles of Natural Theology and of Philosophy long before the same were discovered, made clear, as they had never been before, to human consciousness, and enforced so persuasively, by the Christian Revelation. Inspiration is a gift and condition of the human mind the world over, and throughout all man's generations. Revelation only gives special miraculous instances of the fact; calls attention to the subject; "stirs up the gift" that is in men, by reminding the soul of what it may have forgotten, as well as by unfolding and bringing into conscious use what may have never been thought or dreamed of.

We may affirm that inspiration has always, from the beginning, been pouring down its steady stream of influence, from the Great Source of Intelligence, into created and finite minds. As a doctrine, this belongs to Natural Religion, and it has been suggested and recognized, in one shape or another, in the literatures of all nations, through the fables of their mythologies, if not stated in clear terms and commended to the rational judgment by the sober teachings of sages and philosophers. In all parts of the material world, a constant stream of the electric fluid is and ever has been running. Sometimes, and at certain points, the subtile influence accumulates, and makes unusual demonstration of its existence. There are analogous points in regard to inspiration; such were Moses, Isaiah, Christ. These are epochs in the spiritual history of the race; and we revert to them as signal manifestations, in different degrees, of the Spirit of the Most High. As for the inquiry, Why did that stream of Divine Influence, which has ever been flowing through human minds from the Central Source, pour an extraordinary measure of light and hope into the Hebrew soul, while the Pagan or Gentile intellect was left comparatively void, though it may have had more of native vigor and capacity,

and enjoyed a higher human culture? — we can only say, that such was the unexplained will and appointment of the Highest.

Christianity, then, throws light upon the true method of treating Natural Religion, in regard specially to these three points: that there is a soul or spiritual principle in man, a distinct, and the highest, part of human nature; that there is an actual connection between man's spirit and the Great Spirit, the Holy Spirit, God the Spirit, and, therefore, that we are receptive of influences from this source; and, thirdly, that faith is an organic faculty of the soul, with original and ultimate jurisdiction in regard to moral and religious truth. In fact, Christianity furnished the thinking portion of the world with a *Novum Organon*, in regard to philosophical inquiries respecting morals and religion.

These statements are submitted as important, because it is thought that low views of Natural Religion, as well as of Revealed, have resulted from the habit of assigning to the reasoning principle a higher place and work in both than it is entitled to. Low views of Natural Religion, so called, are as much to be deprecated as low views of Revelation. And they may be traced, in either branch of inquiry, to the same erroneous method. In both we must separate faith from all logical verifications. It is above them in the natural method, and, as we have seen, in the method of Revelation too. It is independent of them. It has no need of them. It is sufficient unto itself; or if there have been superinduced in the soul, through the obscuring, depraving influences of ages of continued sin, any lack of power, of vitality, of sight, that want is to be supplied by Light from above, by the Grace of God through a Divine Mediation, by the quickening energy of the Divine Word, awakening the torpid consciousness of a sin-benumbed race to the true, natural life of faith.

Perhaps our common Protestantism ignored a great truth, when it tore itself passionately, and with something of the blindness which is always connected with passion, from the foul embrace of the Roman Church, and when its subsequent position, in consequence of the great disruption, obliged its champions to rely so much upon the weapons of polemical logic. When the giant

rose from the lap of the harlot, he left with her the locks in which lay hidden his strength. The habit of using those carnal weapons, and of forgetting "the sword of the Spirit," and "the shield of faith," has been handed down to our generation, and we are witnessing and experiencing the bad effects of a bad habit, into which our part of Christendom has stiffened. If, at the time of the Reformation, one great light of our common humanity was extinguished, it is time that it should be rekindled. For it is one of the golden candlesticks that belongs to the Catholic Church of man, and not exclusively to the Church of St. Peter.

Natural Religion is not merely that which rests upon natural reason, which the works of outward nature teach and confirm, but that which is evolved out of man's own nature, that which is truly natural to a human being. The germs of it are in all souls, and these germs are more or less started and unfolded among all races and peoples, and they assume various forms, according to the influences that have acted on the soul, the culture to which it has been subjected, and the manifold local circumstances that determine its particular bias.

A perfectly natural and normal condition of man is a state of religious belief. God made man originally in his own image. This is the assurance which has ever prevailed, the world over, with regard to the primal condition of man. Sin, indeed, has marred the original design; and the theological theory, to account for the loss of the first type, is the doctrine of the Fall. But even through the sin-scarred visage of a fallen humanity, though men for successive generations have striven in all conceivable ways to pervert and brutalize their nature, the Divine lineaments may still be traced. The soul was a palimpsest, on which worthless and foul characters had been imprinted. One chief object of the religion of Christ was to erase these, and to restore in all their freshness the image and superscription of the original.

Natural Religion always embraces the idea of the supernatural. To affirm that particular miracles have been wrought, involves, of course, an historical question; and the alleged facts are to be verified, as all historical points are, by testimony. But to admit the idea and persuasion of the supernatural, is one of the intuitions of the



soul. Though every particular miracle ever alleged and recorded, in sacred or profane writ, were proved false or rendered questionable, the inclination to believe in the supernatural would remain, and supernaturalism, as a doctrine, must always form a part of Natural Religion. The disposition to deny the doctrine wholly has been rebuked in every age. Lord Bacon has said, in his explanation of the fable of Icarus, that "all *defects* are justly esteemed more depraved than *excesses*. There is some magnanimity in excess, that, like a bird, claims kindred with the heavens; but defect is a reptile, that basely crawls upon the earth."

A state of nature is a hypothetical state, to be considered as a point of reference and aim in our reasonings and endeavors, but which had never been realized, since the loss of the same by man after his creation, until Christ revealed the way, and restored the power which had been lost. It required a miracle to bring mankind back to a state of nature. A Natural Religion, in the highest sense of the phrase, would be the religion to which a human being by his endowments is fitted, and for which he was designed; not, as is commonly understood, that which he is able, by his own unaided faculties, notwithstanding all the chronic disabilities and diseases of those faculties, to attain.

But laying aside this view of the subject, let it be observed that the sphere and the capabilities of Natural Religion are unnecessarily restricted by the method that is pursued generally, in referring everything to the understanding, and in adopting the principle that all spiritual truth is to be verified by reasoning alone. It is a fact beyond question, that many truths are so congenial to the soul, so essential to its peace and welfare, that they are received eagerly without ever being referred to the critical judgment.

If faith be one of the original faculties of the soul, it will, like every other faculty, indicate the use to which it is to be put, and will seek its appropriate objects. The idea of a Deity when stated is readily received, because there is an appetency in the soul for such a truth, and because the inborn faculty of faith gives an *a priori* suggestion of some such supersensible reality. The natural fears of the heart give intimations of the existence



of a Divine Judge; and this basis of faith is stronger than any deductive reasoning can furnish. Again, there are dictates, premonitions, of the moral sentiments. For a person to whose consciousness the moral intuitions of the soul have been opened, and who has gained a sense of his accountableness, nothing in the form of logic can increase the force, liveliness, or practical efficiency of a conviction of Deity gained through this channel; nor, if this remained undeveloped, could any arguments which the schools might offer supply its place. The human soul is continually begging the question, in regard to the truth of religion, simply because the Creator has not left what is so essential to man to be originated by the slow processes of the understanding. The matter is prejudged, so urgent are the exigencies of life, long before we begin to philosophize.

There is, says Leibnitz, an inward energy in the soul by virtue of which ideas develop themselves spontaneously. If this be so, then religious ideas—the idea of God, of immortality, of spiritual existences—are unfolded in a like natural mode, out of the innate germs or productive energies in the soul.

In this internal constitution there is a general power of sensibility, and all our sensations are particular products of this. So there is a general cogitative power, and all our notions are separate, distinct outgrowths from this. In like manner there is a capacity for and susceptibility to faith, and all our particular beliefs are results of this, either spontaneously springing, or elaborated by reason and reflection from the materials which nature provides.

“The truth of a notion,” says a modern philosophical writer, “does not consist, as Locke affirms, in the conformity of our idea of it with the outward reality, but upon the validity or trustworthiness of our subjective laws.”\*

In all our notions, then, pertaining to things unseen and spiritual, the notion of God, for example, (where there is no possibility, according to Locke's principle, of testing the conformity of our idea with the objective reality, because we have no faculty by which to judge of that reality,) the only course we can adopt is to refer the

---

\* Morell, p. 253.

notion to the laws of our own mental and spiritual being. Is the notion formed in accordance with those laws? Is it generated and shaped in conformity with the natural and necessary processes of thought? Is it vouched for and authenticated by the soul? If so, it is justified to the understanding when this faculty scrutinizes it; and we can go and need go no further than this in the verification of the notion, and therefore it is true philosophically, that "faith is the evidence of things not seen."

All theology may be called the science of faith. It does not admit of, nor does it require, the same methods of verification that apply to other branches of knowledge. The existence, naturalness, normal propriety of faith, as a phenomenon of the life of the soul, may be looked at distinctly from the actual existence of the objects of faith. These are two conceivably separate subjects of thought. The question whether a God exists, absolutely, is one thing. The question whether we can avoid, without doing violence to certain primary principles of our spiritual nature, forming some notion of a God, and believing in a God, is a quite distinct subject of thought. And for all practical purposes, that is, so far as our individual acts and life are involved, the last-mentioned is to us the most important question. We are immediately concerned with our own beliefs, with the necessary persuasions of our own minds. These are level to our comprehension, and can be made profitable for the real purposes of life. When mortals attempt, Titan-like, to scale the heavens, and to penetrate to the presence of the Eternal, they are hurled back upon the earth where they belong. We cannot solve the mysteries of Infinite Being. No mental instrument we can invent will resolve these nebulae of the heavens.

Although we may with reason reject the doctrine of innate ideas, and may deny therefore that the idea of a God is innate, yet something is innate. "There is the *understanding itself*," according to Leibnitz; "there is the innate faculty of forming ideas, which was altogether overlooked by Locke in his reasoning, and which stands quite independent of sensation." "There are then necessary truths, whose certainty does not spring from experience, but which have their foundation originally in the thinking soul." And we may affirm, with like reason,

There is the soul itself; *this* is innate, and with it the capacity of faith, and this faith of the soul is quite independent of reasoning. It originates in the soul's own vitality.

"Practically speaking," remarks one of your own writers, "we are concerned to know, not so much what things are in themselves, as the manner in which we are affected by the sight of them, and by living in the midst of them."\*

With equal truth we may say that, practically speaking, we are concerned to know and attend to, not so much the objective being and attributes of Deity, which we "cannot, by searching, find out," as the idea of himself which God has been pleased to make us able to conceive; the manner in which we are psychologically affected by him through faith; the phenomena, intellectual, moral, spiritual, emotional, of the receptive and the distributive faculties of our interior constitution. And, viewed thus subjectively, we may say again, with truth, that "faith is the evidence of things not seen."

God is to us an idea. He has declared, in his own Word, that he is a spirit. We cannot behold him with the senses. The vision of God is promised to the pure in heart only. His presence is an ideal presence. We can look only, as Moses did, when he has passed by, and trace the footprints of him who "treadeth upon the high places of the earth." We cannot demonstrate his being. And to whom shall we liken him? We may assert and believe that he has an objective being, that there is a vast reality answering to the conception in the mind, before which we bow in reverential homage. But we can go no further than faith. We can know nothing on the subject by nature, nor could such knowledge be communicated to us without giving us, besides the knowledge, a new set of faculties to apprehend and use it. The idea of God is what alone concerns us.

A doctrine of the soul would seem rightly to precede in the order of time, and in logical order, the statement and proof of any other positive doctrines which are to be commended to the soul's reception. It is as necessary and as important, surely, to consider and study the believing faculty in man, as the articles which he is to be-

---

\* Bowen's Lectures.

lieve. The one is as legitimate a subject of inquiry and investigation as the other. If the fin of the fish, or the wing of the bird, indicate the kind of life which the animal is intended for, the element in which it must move and have its being, the habits it will form, the broader or narrower sweep of its flight, the more or less extensive range of its migrations, and even the objects of its attention, aim, instinctive desire, and pursuit, as well as the kind of food it affects and will naturally seek; in like manner, it were to be expected beforehand that the study of the human soul, whether by introspection, or by attending to the facts which the history of human nature discloses, would be one proper mode of indicating the kind of life which a being so made should pursue, the objects he should aim at and aspire to, the class of truths he would gladly embrace, the element in which he must exercise his powers, and discharge the offices to which he was adapted, the beings separate from himself to whom he was intended to hold conscious relations, and the destiny which he was appointed to fulfil.

We have a doctrine or theory of the intellectual faculties. They have all been analyzed and classified, more or less accurately, and this has always been recognized, among thinking men, as one legitimate branch of science. So too we have a doctrine of the moral sentiments and faculties; and this has always been regarded as a subject for distinct and special investigation. But here, generally speaking, the analysis of man's nature has stopped. We have no doctrine of the soul, examined by analogous methods, and made familiar by clear statements of the facts, the phenomena, the laws, the inborn tendencies and instinctive appetences and workings, of this leading, peculiar organ of the human constitution.

And yet what reason can be given for such a defect? Assuredly this is the first point to be looked at in a natural method of investigating religion. The internal instrument with which we are to operate must be examined, if we would be made aware of the particular ministries in which it is designed to serve. There seems to be a lack of completeness, in this quarter, in the way of dealing with the great subject of Natural Religion. There must be a fallacy somewhere, if we could but detect it. There prevails a vague notion, as if the soul



and all that pertains to it belong to revealed religion, and must be put in that category; and so by a tacit consent men settle into the habit of referring Natural Religion to the reasoning faculty, and Revealed Religion to the soul. Is that the fallacy? If so, we are addressing to one faculty what was meant to be applicable to another and quite different one.

If a sort of Caspar Hauser experiment could be really tried with any human being, if you could by any systematic treatment cruelly pursued kill his conscience, paralyze by some fatal touch the faculty whose special function is to make and recognize moral distinctions, do you believe that all the logic from Aristotle to Whately, accumulated in one battery and discharged at once, could galvanize that maimed fragment of humanity into any semblance of moral life? No more than a treatise upon optics could convey impressions to the retina, if you should sever the optic nerve and so cut off the natural communication between the eyeballs and the brain. And why should we pursue a method equally unnatural in dealing with religion? Why address formal, elaborate arguments for the truth of religion to the cogitative, reasoning faculty, while the latent and dormant sensibilities of the soul remain undeveloped, or are torpid from disuse?

It is an obvious and an important fact, that the belief which is wrought out by merely intellectual processes is not at best that practical working faith, that source of inward power, which the soul needs, and which the real exigencies of man's life call for. In every age men have sought for absolute knowledge with respect to the high points of religion, but in vain. Many have hung over dizzy precipices to reach the glittering prize that tempted them. In the perilous effort one and another has dropped off into the abysses of doubt and despair. And those who have reached and grasped the object which attracted them have found it only an icicle, which broke into a thousand mocking shivers when they attempted to fashion it into an instrument of use and service; and when they clasped it to their hearts, and thought to wear it as a charm, amidst the hot agony of life's struggles, have found it melt in their own fervent heat, and chill the touch that embraced it. It is written as a law for man,



that he must believe with the heart. Nothing is fit for life's real scenes, but what is wrought in the soul's glowing furnace.

Following a course of reasoning like that which is pursued by Bishop Butler in his admirable sermons on human nature, we may say, that —

There are as real and the same kind of indications in human nature, that we were made to believe in, and to hold relations to, a spiritual, supersensible world in general, and to a particular Being, of whom the power, wisdom, goodness, apparent in the universe, may be predicated as attributes, as that we were designed to perceive by the senses, to communicate with, and to hold relations to, the outward, material world; and that the same objections lie against one of these assertions as against the other.

For, first, there is a natural principle of faith in man, which is to the unseen world, and to beings not cognizable by sense, what the senses are to the material realities of which they take notice.

If any person doubt whether there be in man such an organic principle as faith, whose special office is to connect man with the unseen world, let it be observed, that, whether man be thus constituted or not, what is the inward frame of the mind in this particular is a question of fact, or natural history, not provable immediately by reason. It is therefore to be judged of and determined in the same way as other facts or matters of mental history are, by appealing to consciousness, by arguing from acknowledged facts and actions, and by the testimony of mankind. It matters not that faith, in its operations, is very various in different individuals; that it admits of, and actually exhibits, every possible form of delusion; that in some minds it amounts to no more than a bare suspicion or surmise, mingled with doubts, that overcloud its light and neutralize its influence in practice; — the point is made out that such a principle as faith — in something more than the senses can scrutinize — does belong to human nature. Doubtless there is much left for us to do with regard to this innate principle of faith, that it may be wisely unfolded and cultivated, that it may be directed to worthy objects, and applied steadily to the promotion of a virtuous life. This is the work

given in charge to each individual. But if there be in mankind any inclination to pass beyond the sphere of the senses, and if the soul be susceptible of any emotions, or if the actions and life of a person may be influenced, to any extent and in any wise, by such super-sensible ideas, — it matters not, so far as the argument is concerned, how grotesque and monstrous may be the phantoms that may be conjured up, it matters not how irrational or cruel may be the conduct to which such wild beliefs may prompt, — here is evidence of what we are capable of, and here are indications of what we were made for; and the conclusion is just as certain as it would be if the principle which is thus left to run wild were enlightened and kept within due limits by reason and revelation, and were made, by a wise control and direction, the basis of a true life and a virtuous character.

Secondly, the same will further appear from observing, that the several affections and sentiments, which are distinct both from faith and from the perception of the sensible world, do lead us to the unseen and spiritual as really as to objects of sense. Hope and fear, for example, are affections which have manifest uses in regard to the present state of our being. They influence our actions towards our fellow-men. They are important motives, even if we confine our thoughts to the earth, and to the space included between the cradle and the grave. But in point of fact, they are not so limited in their influence. They ascend above the sphere of our present condition. They transcend the limits of time. They are the wings of the soul, bearing us, without our consent, and often against our wills, into the eternity of the future. They are as active as ever when death approaches, when there is no more earthly good to expect and strive for, and no longer anything earthly to dread. When the breath is just leaving the frame, the soul still glows with hope, and still quivers with fear.

It is the same too with the affection of love. This particular affection has objects, and serves important uses in our present and earthly relations. In its various modifications it forms the binding cement of families and communities, and of the race. But it is by no means exhausted by these limited uses. It grows by what it feeds on. It outgrows all terrestrial and sensi-

ble objects. Nothing finite and earthly is great or wise or good enough to receive its fulness. There is a large amount of its power reserved, for lack of any being here below upon whom it may be worthily bestowed. There is no proportion between the higher modifications of the sentiment, such as adoration, homage, entire self-surrender, and any finite being, however exalted and excellent. Yet the heart demands some object of worship, as truly as it craves some friend to sympathize with. The sensible world, then, and the relations that bind us to it, do not furnish exercise for the soul's highest affections, — do not exhaust, or do justice to, its capacities.

Thirdly, there is a principle of reflection and reason in men, by the help of which they supervise, adjust, control, and regulate their several powers, and among others the faculty of faith, and the particular affections which lead upward, outward, and forward, to the spiritual, the infinite, and the eternal. This cool, supervisory power is manifestly designed to preserve the other faculties in their just relations to each other, and to keep them within proper limits. It does not create faith; but, by a well-timed intervention, opposes its deliberate counsels, and, in some exigencies, its persistent scepticism, to arrest the mind in its progress to extravagant credulity. It does not oppose, or interfere with, the imagination, in its proper offices; but only prevents that faculty from running into wild and monstrous inventions, gives verisimilitude to its creations, and reduces its overcharged tints to a sober and harmonious coloring. It does not undertake the vain task to eradicate from the heart the various affections and passions of which man is susceptible, or to limit their exercise to this earthly scene, but only tempers their fervors to a safe and salutary warmth, by maintaining some proportion between the feeling and the objects upon which it is bestowed.

But it may be asked, by way of objection to this kind of reasoning, Are there not, as a matter of fact, multitudes of human beings in whom the principle of faith is so imperfectly unfolded, that it is only as a light shining in a dark place, and which the darkness does not comprehend? Are there not multitudes of human beings in whom the earthward tendencies are so controlling, that they may be said with truth to be "living

without God in the world," and with no reference to any unseen and spiritual realities? These questions may be met, so far as the present argument is concerned, by asking in return, Are there not, in like manner, multitudes of human beings whose perceptions gained through the senses are so dull, that they fail to understand the world with whose gross realities they are in daily and hourly contact; whose judgment is so poorly trained, that they miss of success in their temporal affairs; whose forecast and providence are so scanty, that they are ever sacrificing their real and permanent worldly interest to the pursuit of immediate gratification, and whose desires, instead of bearing them forward to the attainment of any high or any useful object in a worldly career, are limited to, and wasted upon, trifling, if not positively base and pernicious ends?

Now the same account is to be given in both of the analogous cases which the argument has presented. The purpose of the Creator, as indicated in man's nature, is not falsified in either of these cases by the facts of life. It is only thwarted by the intervention of other principles, by the unfortunate neglect or criminal perversion of that nature which was originally constituted aright.

We may understand, then, in what sense it is true, theoretically, that Religion consists in following nature, that Natural Religion is a sure and safe guide to man. If by human nature be meant any single principle, the doctrine would be, not false alone, but mischievous. If the imagination be followed without any control or direction, it would lead us into all the absurdities and grossnesses of heathen idolatry. If fear were to be our sole guide, we should become dupes of a slavish superstition. If we judged of the disposition and purpose of the Creator by the weak fondness of our own hearts towards our favorites, we should be presuming upon a goodness in whose view vice and virtue were of like value. If we trusted to the understanding alone, though we could succeed, through a wild sea of doubts, in reaching any solid ground, we should gain only a few abstractions; and how much heart's ease or reliable strength of purpose these could impart, any thinking man can estimate. We might gain the notion of a law,



a fixed order of the universe ; a huge pantheistic image might be before the mind, which, like the face of Medusa, would turn him who contemplated it to stone ; but no Personal God, no Father of Mercies, no Spirit communicating with human spirits. Even the conscience, when separated from the religious convictions of the soul, is no sure guide for man.

The only sense, therefore, in which it can be theoretically true that religion consists in following nature, is when the whole of our complex nature is unfolded harmoniously, each faculty in its order and place. And whether it is possible to realize such a theory of Natural Religion without the aids of Revelation, is as doubtful as it is certain that the end never has, in fact, been attained.

The complaint is heard quite frequently of a lack of faith in our age. Many regret the period of mediæval history, as having been eminently an age of faith. And some of those who cast such regretful glances backward in this mood would be willing to run the hazard of restoring the ignorance and demi-civilization, the serfdom, the rude *brusquerie* of a military period, if they might only see once again the depth of homage, the capacity for enthusiasm, the general mobility of the public mind, which then prevailed. But we need not go to the length of any such extravagance. Let science and civilization proceed with their ameliorating influences upon the outward condition of man. Let the understanding apply itself to unlock as many of the secrets of the material universe as it can. Let the exact, cautious, sceptical method continue in whatever concerns man's physical well-being. The grand mistake, according to the doctrine of this discourse, is in applying the same method to morals and religion.

It may be made a question whether the philosophy of Bacon, which has wrought such marvels for the benefit of the world in physical science, has not been to an equal extent pernicious in regard to morals and religion. The habit which it has induced, of looking only at sensible facts and of using the understanding alone, while the higher facts of consciousness are neglected and the intuitions of the soul are ignored, has been followed by disastrous consequences.



The successors of Bacon proceeded in the line which his sagacious and cold-hearted genius had pointed out. Locke in England gave systematic application to his principles, so far as they related to mental philosophy. But Locke was too good, too Christian a man to go where Bacon had pointed the way. Others of coarser and less scrupulous natures followed, until, under their influence, man was reduced to a lusty and beautiful brute, out of whom, with the dissecting-knife of their subtle analysis, they had extracted all soul, — in the mysterious chambers of whose complex nature their foul chemistry had dissolved all faith, and had left only a *caput mortuum* of earthy matter, as the worthless residuum of immortal man.

Our age has grown so jealous of religion, that it is ashamed to avow that it holds a faith that is not based upon logic. Faith now is too frequently nothing more than so much assent, slowly and grudgingly rendered to so much evidence; and in many cases the reasoning used is so narrow and inconclusive, so incommensurate with the largeness and importance of the truths which it is brought to substantiate, that the assent given under such circumstances amounts to almost nothing in a practical point of view. It does not reach and touch the springs of feeling and action in the heart. And what is it worth, if it cannot do that? Let the method be laid aside. Let the false habit of mind thus engendered, the all but inevitable scepticism or indecision that must follow from the application of this method, be broken up. Let men no longer be ashamed to believe without a formal scholastic reason. Let common, untrained minds, especially, refuse to be robbed of their faith by sophistical objections. Let them cling to the intuitive convictions of their souls, — to the *a priori* dictates of nature and of God. From these ideals of the soul burst forth all the virtues of life, in like manner, and by as sure a law, as all the glories of the vegetable world are expanded at this genial season, when the quickening touch of spring causes the naked rod, which the Earth has held up in her hand the winter long, to bud.

We must go back to the method of nature. You see what that method is, not only as it is suggested in Christianity, upon the highest authority and followed by

a success which has no parallel in the history of our race, but you also see it when you look into the common mind, and watch the workings of the leaven in those who have not been sophisticated by school training. The great heart of the race does not beat to the music of syllogisms. And if we would verify religion, by summing up in an abstract way the principles upon which its truth depends, we must follow the method in which it operates upon masses of men, and by which it gains currency in the world.

The Christian faith originated in the Oriental mind. That was never cramped and fettered by logic. It mused, and the fire burned beneath those still musings of the desert. The Occidental touch has only smothered that flame with its artificial contrivances, and reversed the method of Isaiah and of Christ.

I know that, in taking this ground, the discourse may be met by an objection. It may be alleged that the doctrine furnishes an apology for extravagance of all sorts, and may lead to an abject, slavish submission. To this I have to reply, that there are three kinds of faith very distinguishable. There is, first, the faith of authority, as when one blindly adopts, without any attempt to examine or to verify in any way, the dicta of a particular church, or the articles prescribed by an establishment. Next, there is the faith of reason, as when one attempts to legitimate his beliefs by processes of deduction and inference, in which processes the understanding is assumed to be the tribunal that has sole and final jurisdiction. And thirdly, there is the faith of the soul, as when we consciously and intelligently introspect our spiritual organism, examine its constituent elements, watch it not only at rest but when in action, observe its working habits, reflect upon the laws of its life, and so obtain a justification of religion from the unwritten signatures of truth which the Creator has imprinted upon the soul. Now, to confound this with an unquestioning, slavish submission to authority is simply irrelevant.

Too often an apologetic tone is assumed in regard to religion by its advocates. The rationalistic style of our day is as if men were half ashamed of believing, and must make out a case *in curia rationis*. It is an inch-by-inch measurement of the ground on which they stand.

It is a striking of balances, and sometimes there is a difficulty to determine whether belief shall be put on the side of debtor or creditor. It is a literal weighing of evidence, so much belief against so much logic, and the faith which is so weighed, in balances suited for grosser articles, not unfrequently kicks the beam.

Can you manufacture anything noble, disinterested, generous, out of such leaden materials? Can you extract any poetry, any epic, either of fancy or of real life, from such lumpish matter, and by so coarse a method? Can you get a crusade, or a mission to the heathen wastes of Africa, or a mission of mercy to the battered wretches that crowd the hospitals of the Crimea, out of such stuff as this? Can you send the cunning into the plastic hand of an Angelo, or inspire the sweet and grave muse of a Dante or a Milton, by such mechanical contrivances? You may fashion an image after the resemblance of man. Every muscle may be copied, every limb may be rounded after nature, every feature may be a transcript of life's best specimens, every line may be drawn with expressive truthfulness. But can you put a soul under that marble figure? Can you make it breathe? Can you give speculation to those stony eyeballs, or cause those closed lips to open and quiver with the word of intelligence? Is not the method we are considering as if Pan should steal the lute of Apollo, and, after breaking it to pieces to find out the secret of its music, should throw it on the ground, and try to play upon it with his cloven foot?

The unbelief from which we have most to fear, and which is most prevalent, extends farther than to the rejection of any particular system of theological dogmas, any authorized credenda of special communions, or any dispensation of positive truth. It questions the grounds of all religious faith, and ignores the existence and trustworthiness of any principle or faculty in man, whose function it is to believe in things "unseen, spiritual, and eternal." The great heresy of our period is not a denial of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, or of any other of the thousand formulas of positive doctrine that proceed *ex cathedra Romæ*, or from any other propaganda in Christendom. But it is a heresy to humanity. It is a denial of the crowning attribute of man. It is

disbelief in the soul. We believe in and worship a huge idol, — the material universe, — which, like Nebuchadnezzar's image, has a head of gold, and feet of iron and clay. We are intent upon running a continuous wire round the globe, that we may chaffer with the Orientals by lightning, — a stupendous achievement, doubtless, which science has shown to be theoretically possible, and which experiment is trying to prove practicable; and the whole world is leaning, with eyelids ajar, to watch the doing of the design. And at the same time we have recklessly destroyed that better telegraph, which existed in what we term ages of darkness, and which led from earth to the world of spirits, fetching and carrying communications between the Fount of Being and the souls of men.

It would seem, therefore, that the leading duty of the day is to vindicate the spiritual nature of man, to state the special function of the soul, as distinct from the ratiocinating intellect, as the believing organ *suo jure*, a great fact of our higher life which has been lost sight of through mere desuetude. Our habit leads us to go out of the soul, and to observe and reason upon objective entities and quantities, and it is the unavoidable consequence of such a method that our conclusions remain objective. The argument from design for the being of a God, for example, makes the universe a curious and admirable piece of clock-work. It must have had a contriver, we justly conclude; but such a conclusion, however logically arrived at, does not imply certainly, at least does not necessarily fasten the conviction upon our minds, that we have any personal connection with that Contriver, except that we use his handiwork for our benefit, and sometimes misuse it to our mischief. The common mode of proceeding in our religious speculations is as if we should import an exotic flower and fasten it to a native stalk in our gardens. It may be so arranged as to attract notice and admiration for its beauty so long as it remains fresh; but it did not grow there, and it draws no nourishment from, because it has no organic connection with, the living plant to which it is fastened. It fades quickly, and leaves behind no power to produce a like flower from the same soil and plant. An argument may be logically perfect. As an invention



of the art of reasoning, it may delight the mind of a trained thinker; but unless it has some living connection with the soul, it can exert no permanent influence, and that living connection can only be secured by first unfolding the soul itself to the consciousness. The insect does not range through nature for materials from which to spin the delicate web on which she swings. She spins it from herself. Whatever carries man away from the soul and its *a priori* convictions unships his rudder and sets him afloat upon a shoreless ocean of inquiry, ever sailing, without a port. Arachne's cloth, in which she drew with so cunning a sleight the mystic thread, to depict the amours of the old divinities, was copied from the pictures in her own teeming fancy. This was what angered Athena; and when the envious lady changed her into a spider, it was the best illustration the fable could give of the creative power of the soul.

There is in the human soul not only a power of generating thoughts and convictions, but also a law of limitation and combination that necessitates the particular form which thoughts shall assume. The rounded sphere in whose hollow blue we are rolling, and on which are projected to our vision the stars and systems of the universe, so shapes itself to our eyes, not because this is its actual objective figure in space, but simply because this is the shape which the heavens must take in accordance with the subjective conditions of the organ of sight, and the limitations of our optical power. We can see so far in any direction. Each glance of the eye measures a radius, and terminates in a point in space; and the total of these infinite points must describe a hollow sphere to the human spectator.

Except the soul, nothing pertaining to man is enduring. Time is a relentless innovator; and even the most sacred subjects are not exempt from his influences. But if we look at nature, some permanent features are conserved, while around these fixed points there surges a flood of endless change. What suited the times of Dudley, our benefactor, is not applicable now. And yet our period, if not as positively religious, yet in tendency and capacity is as much inclined to, and as susceptible of, religious ideas and emotions, and as capa-

ble of being swayed by religious motives, as any period that has preceded it. It is true, that, whenever any high pressure that has borne upon the minds of men for a long time is removed, there is a centrifugal movement, and, in the case of individuals, faith may be renounced; and at intervals like these many are ready to fear, and to predict, that never more will supersensible, religious ideas control the minds and actions of men. A carnival of the intellect succeeds, when every restraint of sane thought is let fly, and all the buffoonery of a godless and conscienceless freedom is indulged in. But this cannot last long. Lent will come round again in the great year of God; and then men will be humble, and with humility faith will once more resume its natural place in the soul.

Every period must have, and will have, its own conceptions of religion, and its own way of administering it. Forms are transient and perishable. Forms of thought, of religious opinion even, last not long. Only the judgments of the soul survive. Every generation will have its own philosophy, its own creed, its own interpretation of nature and life, its own point of vision and instruments of observation, its own ways of stating, generalizing, verifying, illustrating, and applying its ideas. But there are the same heavens to look upon as in the days of the Patriarchs and the Puritans. And there are fixed stars, too, in the moral firmament of man, that have no motion, no parallax, to mortal observation and measurement, that remain for points of reference *in secula seculorum*.

You, gentlemen undergraduates of the University, are new-comers into this vast theatre of observation which the universe of God presents; and you bring fresh minds to the study of those momentous themes upon which the Genius of Philosophy has been musing for centuries. Do not fly off to the conclusion, which young and ardent minds are quick to resort to, that faith is dead, that religion is obsolete, a subject for history, and not a matter for new consciousness and experience. This is poor drivelling, allow me to say, not as a preacher, but as a fellow-student. It may suit the musty misanthrope, who has clouded his intellect, and been brought to repudiate the debts which he owes to himself and to God, by his

worldliness and sensuality, and who has dallied so long with harlots that he has forgotten the mother that bore him. But this reprobate condition of mind is not predicable, surely, of youth,—clear-eyed, undistempred, elastic, believing youth,—fresh from God, new spectators of the marvels and glories of creation, with unworn, unperturbed affections panting in their bosoms. Infuse into your generation the leaven of a high thought, and leave it to work. Do not separate yourselves from your kind by unbelief or by indifference on this great argument. You will not think to move the living world, unless you sympathize with that living world. I do not say, Follow in the wake of the ruling opinion of the hour. No such sentiment shall pollute my lips, or provoke a rebuke either from those who now guard the interests of learning and religion here, or from the dead whose memories consecrate these walls. No such lesson as that was ever taught to your predecessors in these seats. And if any among us have learned that lesson, they have learned it elsewhere. But still I say, Keep very close to the beating heart of your race. If every other argument which Natural Religion has to offer should prove invalid, the universal interest of those with whom you share a fellow-humanity, and on whom you are to act hereafter, will suggest to the most sceptically inclined among you that they have blindly overlooked the most important element in a thorough self-culture, and are rashly resisting a law which directs and governs the souls of men, the world over, and throughout the ages.

The piety of the Christian Church many centuries ago instituted a festival of ALL SOULS, “in commemoration,” as is said, “of such of the dead as are not yet admitted to the contemplation of their Maker.” Our subject brings before the mind the vision of *all souls*, of the vast multitude which no one can number, from the first man, conversing face to face with his Maker, down to the little child of to-day, lisping his matins and vespers at a mother’s knee. These all have confessed, by their fears, if not by the faith of innocence, or by the better faith of a tried and manly virtue, that there is a God, whose awful presence gives a solemn significance to our earthly life and lot; that there is over us, over the race to which we belong, over nature and time, a Power

ever brooding with outstretched wings, protecting, cherishing, blessing all.

Such is the testimony of ALL SOULS. If we bring before us ideally this mighty host of witnesses, how insignificant appear the dissenters from the grand truth, the few godless intellects that have ventured to question the creed of a world, and to cut themselves off from the sympathy of a race! In the presence, though but ideal, of such a "cloud of witnesses," can any one be bold enough, so much of a man — shall I say? or so little of a man — as to avow his unbelief? Is not the principle which draws every individual to his kind, by a sure instinct, and a persuasion that the voice of God's people is, in this great argument, the voice of God himself, stronger than any pride of opinion, or any stubborn peculiarity, keeping him aloof?

And therefore I may be allowed to say again, Keep close to the beating heart of your race. Avoid the danger, which inheres in every system of scholastic discipline, of despising the dictates of the common intellect, and the instincts of the common heart. And here let me call to your recollection a remark of the most distinguished and most successful author of our period, made in reply to some one who attached an undue importance to mere literary accomplishments, and who affected to regard with contempt the common intellect: "I have read books enough, and observed and conversed with enough of eminent and splendidly cultivated minds, too, in my time; but, I assure you, I have heard higher sentiments from the lips of poor, *uneducated* men and women, when exerting the spirit of severe yet gentle heroism under difficulties and afflictions, or speaking their simple thoughts as to circumstances in the lot of friends and neighbors, than I ever yet met with out of the pages of the Bible."

In all matters pertaining to the heart, and conscience, and soul, you will be able to verify these words by your future experience, and will find, as you may be called, either by professional duty or other relations, to mingle with the needy and the unlettered, that you are only among your peers, and that in your intercourse with them you have much to receive, as well as much to impart.



One other suggestion, closely connected with the sentiments which have been offered in this discourse, and I will close.

Do I err widely from the truth in saying, that the highest achievement of culture ever and everywhere is, not to quench any of the spontaneous flames of the soul, or to darken any of its native intuitions by cumbrous learning and by the artifices of the sophist, but to tone down its wild freedom and vigor to the ease and grace of trained action and bearing? The educated man is always in danger of contracting a scholastic and artificial habit of thought, and he in this way loses from his mind a just appreciation of, and from his heart a relish for, what is simple and natural. There is good reason why we should distinguish Natural Religion, not solely from Revelation, but also from the formal, unnatural methods of treating the subject in the schools. In the one case, it is a fountain within men, that keeps itself pure and full; in the other, it is a reservoir, that must be replenished constantly from without. No wealth of learning, no acquired subtilty of thought, no skill in dialectics, will supply the place of those intuitions of the conscience and soul which testify, to all, of God and of Right.

---

#### ART. II. — THE GOAL OF LIFE.

WE live; but why do we live? It is remarkable that we can give a reason for anything sooner than for our existence, and answer anything more easily than that question. What is the true aim and ideal success of man's life? A traveller, being asked whither he journeys, answers readily, To London, Paris, or Palestine. Or, if his aim be less definite, he is still able to give some rational account of it. And finding one who could neither tell whither he was going, nor why he set out, we should involuntarily look around to discover if his keeper or guardian were with him, or whether he had escaped alone. Yet on the road of life how many a traveller is that same witless individual! Others go, he goes with them; but neither he nor they can tell why or whither.

But might not the goal of man's life be represented as Freedom, and all our sincerest aims and noblest purposes be profitably arranged under this one symbol? Let it be said that man enters existence upon the plane of simple Necessity. The infant does not act, but Nature acts in its behalf; and this action, while there is no defeated endeavor, no perverted energy, no sustained purpose, is symmetrical and beautiful; yet it is that only of predetermined nature, and not of an electing spirit. "Born free," says the Declaration of Independence. But if this be spoken of political liberty, then all which can be affirmed is, that such freedom, being necessary to the development of any human soul, is its indefeasible right; but it becomes a realized right only through a certain constitution of society. The individual, therefore, inherits this possession, not as an inevitable consequence of natural birth, but as the result of a great birth-act and continuing growth in the social organism. While, if respect be had to that grander freedom which dwells in the spirit, we may only say that its attainment is the duty, its possession the reward, the blessedness, and beauty of every soul.

Beginning life as the subject-children, we are by no means as yet the vassals, of Nature. Already Necessity looks beyond itself: the wholeness, the symmetry and unconscious smiling trust of infant existence prefigure that nobler integrity and higher peace of manhood, wherein the soul, freely electing the laws it perceives, through the pre-established harmony between itself and all truth, obeys its own choice in obeying God. Developed manhood is to the life of the child what harmony is to melody, not one simple strain, but the free co-ordination of many, — the aspiring treble, firm manly tenor, pleading counter, and deep-hearted, earnest base, blending into a unity above their separate selves. But this is somewhat to be *achieved*. Whatever advantages genius may confer, this was never Nature's free gift to the most beloved of her favorites. Only the true master, and after due apprenticeship, will so write the notes, or strike the keys, of life.

The soul, at first reposing absolutely in that element of simple necessity from which its ascent must be made, soon begins to throb with higher desires, and looks forth

from its nest to the blue expanse wherein its true home shall be. "I wish I could fly," cries the child, gazing at the swallows; and its spirit utters its inmost longing in that exclamation. The soul, beholding that free flight, takes the hint, and strives to spread its own wings. Look back to the childhood of humanity, and beneath the auroral splendors you will behold it standing with clasped hands and upward gaze, a child longing to fly. It is the earliest attitude of the great and generous, the glorious prattlers, "baby Jupiters," who beneath the consecrating hands of time are made venerable as the fathers of human thought. While the morning breezes play through their locks, and the first gushes of light fall athwart their brows, they sing to themselves of freedom; and the blessed echoes, like the voice of rills purling through the vales of heaven, linger yet in the air. This only it was which the Stoics imagined and portrayed. Their sage was a full-length portrait of one who has been delivered from all durance and drudgery. Cicero follows them in his fifth paradox, "That the wise man alone is free, and that every fool is a slave." A mighty longing for freedom, conjoined with the loftiest religious inspiration, pervades the letters of St. Paul. Plato, after his magnificent fashion, paints it, and points it out as the aim of life, in the apologues of the Phædrus. Far earlier, the Hindoo sages had named "deliverance from the bond of action" as the only lasting enrichment; and with crude, but splendid wisdom, had sought to indicate the path by which it might be attained. And still in every generous soul the story of man's noble beginnings is retold; and the aspiration for freedom blows across the hearthstone of the young heart, till all its energies kindle and spring up into flame.

On the lowest plane here named, that of necessity, man may lawfully extend himself, achieve results, obtain development. But by virtue of this life and action he is merely the first animal of the world, the "featherless biped," excelling in their own line his feathered and his four-footed relatives, the denizens of forest, field, and air. If we consider his lower labors and palpable prosperities, and thence turn to contemplate the courses of beasts and birds, close analogies become apparent, no less marked than those which science shows between his anatomical

structure and theirs. These poor cousins of ours, in their restricted way, and with their limited instrumentalities, set us the example of many and vaunted performances, and pioneer us to many a celebrated success. They also talk, build houses, make roads, wage wars. In their modulated sounds no human ear can be so dull as not to have heard a rudimental language; the honey-bee shows us an organized society; the mole and others have roads and streets; the ants have their Marengos and Waterloos, with prodigious slaughters and glorious victories; the beaver had built dams before Lowell and Manchester were dreamed of. We distance the poor fellows quite, with our free arms, long digitals, and superior cerebrum. The house of the fox or prairie-dog is a crude affair beside our comfortable, ventilated edifices, furnace-warmed and gas-lighted; the streets of the mole make an insignificant show compared with Roman roads and modern railways; the ablest general of the ants droops his plumes in the presence of Cæsar or Napoleon; the stored riches of the bee last but a single winter, and in the spring it is penniless again. We can serve our wants more handsomely than they. But here we are still serving, and not free. Here, still man is the subject of wants originating in his organization, the vassal of his inclinations and needs; sowing that he may be full, and building that he may be sheltered; striving to become rich through the accumulations he acquires, and not through the wings he gains; becoming rich, but not getting himself the everlasting riches. He is opulent as respects the means of temporary satisfactions; but the child of poverty, if man's only true possession be the eternal beauty and good. The true work of man is creative. God's architect, he should build what eternity has designed; find rude stone, and leave a glorious temple. His genuine success it is, out of confusion to bring order; out of darkness, light; to knead and mould the opaque and unshapen into form and translucence, acceptable to the eye of reason, and transmitting the warm rays of human thought and affection. In fine, it is his where was no human world to create one, — a sphere of sweet manly sentiment, of intelligence and recognized truth. The issue into this higher human sphere alone renders him free. And within every soul the call to this is



uttered, a voice of infinite authority, saying, as the host in the parable to his humble guest, "Go up higher"; and from all spiritual heights, the habitations of true heroes in the world's reverent memories, sounds down a sacred invitation, "Come up, to be an inhabitant of the azure and a companion of the stars."

Touching and tragic are the blind endeavors of men to make acquisition of that high freedom; and the seas of life are all laden and strown with wrecks of ships that sailed, but never came to shore. For few have learned to ask wisely of the oracle in the breast; few can wait with divine patience, bending attentive ear till authentic answer be given; too many accept vague hearsays, tumid testimonies of rumor, far-off, mutilated, and mistaken echoes of old responses; too many dash hurriedly off with the first breeze that blows, accounting swift and easy sailing to be success till upon the uncharitable ocean the sure foundering come, or the eyeless, unreasoning currents wrap them away, with deaf despatch, to their ruin-peopled dens and felon haunts.

First, the strong were bewitched with the imagination of boundless and lawless power. Were not one free with the populous world awaiting his nod, his will the mainspring by which alone the mighty mechanism of nations should be moved, his right hand armed with a sceptre wand, at whose wave innumerable peoples should start up to save or slay, or sink down in spell-bound, prostrate awe? Limitless power,—were not this limitless liberty, at least to me, though slavery to all besides? And fired by the imagination, lo, the conqueror comes to make the broad earth the untethered scope of his will, with bannered hosts, with music and march, and sharpened steel gleaming far and wide. He comes to write in red letters one privileged name on the scroll of freedom. "Smite down opposition with swift strokes of strong arms; let the keen edge cut through the living wall; yea, rear the ghastly structure of human skulls, a testimony terrible beyond refutation that here was a will that could not be thwarted, a liberty to which two hemispheres could set no bounds!"

But liberty lies in the conjunction of a will with truth. It there arises where the law, old as eternity and indestructible as God, is born afresh in the reasonable

choices of a human spirit. And as hydrophobia is more constraining than whip or chain, and the mad brute flying abroad, a token of terror, is ten thousand times enslaved, so in man license and domination may be but the measure of subjection. The gluttonous mosquito perishes by its own unrestricted voracity; and the lawless will makes itself full to its own hurt. Every fetter that one, by the mere right of might, puts upon another, remains also with himself, an iron weight to be borne; the enchained Prometheus ever holds some secret, invaluable to tyrant Jove; and the despot sinks beneath his own power, as sometimes the ancient men-at-arms sank under the oppression of their own armor. One is ever enslaved by any addition of palpable power from without, which he cannot meet and master by a divine energy within, so that wisdom shall give laws to authority, and self-sovereignty hold in poise eternal rule. And this power, so far from being the equivalent of liberty, is its opposite term, precluding rather than producing it. For comment on which text, turn to Oriental history, and see lawless despotism always taking refuge from itself in servile submission to the caprices of favorites, constantly keeping the balance even, and choosing out for itself a degradation exactly equal to that it enforced upon others. In those last prolonged years of disgrace and bitterness in Rome, the successful general ruled the empire, the army ruled the general, lust ruled the army; slavish appetite was the root of power, and the fruit was after its kind. And thus the wise and truly great will accept power only at the behest of duty, and guard against its encroachments upon their own will, like those that watch against the surprises of a plotting and relentless enemy.

But while the strong and stern pursue this illusion, there are others who seek enlargement through the whirl of intoxication and mad forgetfulness of laws and limits. "Summon the devil of wine," they cry; "let the wild delight of the body bring succor to the fettered soul; away with obedience, away with reverence, away with chastity; no more of conscience, of restraint; there is joy to be had for the taking, and all life may be a dance to nimble feet. Why do the gods withhold their pleasures from us? Why may they alone do what they will? Let

blooming Hebe bring us nectar, let us quaff and sing; joyous waking, ambrosial sleep, shall bring the circling delight of days around. We will not abide these checks and limits; we will not climb the rugged steep to heaven's door: paradise is ours by privilege of birth, and the wand of wine shall let us in!"

But the dream grows ghastly; the madness continues, the delight is gone; for not from celestial form, but from infernal caldron, where the witches circle and mutter around the simmering herbs, the false nectar was drawn.

But times change, bringing change to men; the sun of prudence ascends to the zenith; and the sober intoxication of gain succeeds to the dream of power, and the delusive emancipations of wine. Not fiery Mars, nor jolly Bacchus, but calculating Mammon now, with downward eyes that gaze in heaven on the golden floor, holds the gift of freedom. With goods laid up for many years, what constraint could there be? And then the misguided aspirant, perhaps unconsciously, says to himself: "I will lay land to land, heap gold upon gold, and add ship to ship; I will own the winds and gravitation; water shall run down hill, vapor ascend, and the sun shine for my profit and behoof; and from my all-dispensing hands the multitudes shall take their daily bread. And when not only men, but the pure river and the ocean wind, shall toil for me, — for me the imprisoned steam shoulder the piston, and the sun's rays quicken the sod, — then surely my enlargement will have come." But riches, like power, obey the rule, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away." They bring enrichment to the opulent soul, and enlargement to that already delivered; but the indigent spirit they impoverish, and the fettered will they bind anew. The dwarf is defenceless beyond his natural imbecility, with his right hand tied to the hilt of the giant's sword; and the miser is more miserable with each new-acquired coin. He who by his pecuniary interest in all the elements has entangled his whole being in considerations of pecuniary interest only; who values the sun's glow and glory only for the succulent roots it will bring to his cellar and the ripe grain to his barn; who prizes the green foliage only for the patterns it may suggest to his designer, and the sunset splendor for the

tint of salable hues; who sees in men only *instruments*, which he may use to load more heavily his groaning coffers, and add fresh superfluity to his plethoric abundance, — to that man increase is impoverishment, is ingenious beggary; he is bound in chains to which iron is as straw, and adamant as clay in the hands of the potter.

But man still gets onward, however slowly and tortuously; and his advances may be marked by his errors, no less clearly than by his cultures and achievements. It will be observed that though power, riches, and inebriate license bring not freedom, yet high authority and wide command are the prerogative of the wise and able; the dancing spirits of health are a natural stimulation, and one may sometimes not unlawfully add by conscious appliance to his store in this kind; and material wealth is the proper substratum of a true prosperity. And so we shall next come to that which is good, excellent, admirable, in its correct uses and applications; though not furnishing, while it is widely believed to furnish, an issue into the only freedom that is not merely beneficial and valuable, but essential and invaluable. The last device and possession by which it is erringly supposed that souls shall be liberated, and candidates for humanity become men, is a political constitution and universal suffrage. "The advancing thoughts and steps of mankind procure the truth and reach the goal at last," it is said: "the ballot is the true Open sesame! at the sound of which the mighty gates fly back, and the nations pour forth into the broad green spaces and sunny airs of liberty."

One would utter no word in disparagement of constitutions, of political adjustments, of privileges and immunities established by convention. These are true social achievements, by their existence marking an era, and denoting a victory. But however admirable as instruments, they make a sorry succedaneum for muscle and real human energy; the happy prolongation and appropriate ornament of a strong arm, they are the reproach of weakness, and betray the imbecility they seem to succor; they add efficiency to those who would not be helpless without them, but when thrust beneath the shoulder as an indispensable crutch, the resource of



infirmity and a substitute for natural vigor, they make not a nation of freemen, but only manifest a company of cripples.

The ballot-box, when its utmost claim is allowed, can be termed only a more peaceful and perfect instrumentality for collecting suffrages, that less perfectly and quietly would be given under all circumstances. Everything votes. The stone votes that it will lie still: you vote that it shall move; the majority will prevail. The wind votes that your house shall go down; if the architect has obtained a larger vote to the contrary, it will stand, and still give safe shelter from sun and storm. The unbroken colt votes that it will not go in harness; perhaps he will find himself in the minority. These majorities, it will be perceived, are not merely numerical, but have far more respect to quality than to quantity,—so do all majorities that the universe deigns to recognize and pronounce real. Thus the ballot is simply a pre-arranged *expression*, prudent or otherwise, of such perceptions and moral forces as exist. But the expression is not the force, and this itself may be a force of free will, or of deaf hunger and blind fate. One is not made free by holding a ballot in his hand, but by having a free hand in which to hold the ballot.

Political *well-being* consists in the wise combination of the millions for the securing of a certain limited outward good to each individual. Political *liberty* constitutes no small portion of the result reached. This is obtained by providing a space around each personality, on which no one shall outwardly and palpably encroach but at his peril. And in whatever wise these combinations may take place, with or without universal suffrage, this guarded sanctity of the person is the right of every human being. So each society should say, "This space is thine; within this dwell securely, develop the virtues and energies thou hast, eat the fruit of thy labors in peace." Without this great piece of social justice, feeble personalities will be drawn out of their orbits, and annihilated by the strong; as if Jupiter should devour his moons, and the sun devour Jupiter and the solar system, and all the lesser stars of heaven cease their separate shimmering, lost in the maw of a few gluttonous and swollen orbs. Yea, and without this, even great charac-

ter may suffer loss, be defrauded at least of external activity, and noble Dion have to wait upon poor egotist Dionysius.

Yet within this consecrated space, when society has done all its duty, the individual has the whole vast range of moral possibilities to himself, and may be either the child of Freedom or the drudge of Nature; either a noble human personality, or merely a two-legged animal without feathers. You may regulate, as to certain tangible matters, his relations to the largest society, the nation; he will for the most part regulate his own relations to the universe. And if in these more subtle and deeper relations, the root-facts of his being and the source of all other facts, he be crude and brutish, no Abbé Sieyes with a whole cornucopia of constitutions in his head, no admirable conventions and democratic enfranchisements, will do other than leave him the ignoble instrument they found him.

There is a tyranny worse than that of Roman Neros and Russian Czars. There is a slavery worse than chains can make, or whips and knouts enforce. And, as if to demonstrate the comparative futility of eternal arrangements, it is in the vaunted blaze and noonday splendor of political illumination that this shape of darkness loves to stalk abroad. Every popular government, from ancient Athens to modern America, is infested by a class whose lusty bawling of "liberty," "rights of the people," and the like, is but the deep-mouthed baying of their greed and hungry longing to devour. The gods of the ballot-box, they are the sewers and scavengers of nature. Or they are the suppurations of the body politic, channels for the diseases and base humors of the state. One may stand for certain months as the sublime and anointed manifestation of a nation's liberty, his high-reared forehead seeming to displace the stars, while within him, beneath all his brilliant wrappage of appearance, a human soul shall be picking cotton, a sweatier slave than Georgia or Carolina ever saw. He who is in bondage by his will cannot be made free by his position.

Neither can circumstance enslave those whom character has fully liberated. Nature's diploma and certificate of honorable graduation from her university, popes, kings, peoples, may refuse to acknowledge, but they cannot

take it away. What she has said none can unsay, and the attempt but brings into relief the letters of adamant in which her decision was written. Thus it is under deprivation of political right that the essential freedom, the absolute play and harmony of an emancipated spirit, has shone forth with purest glory and power. Orion wears his shining belt by day also, but night alone reveals it.

Thus Romanism seized upon John Knox, and bound him to the galley-oar. One day a monk pressed the image of the Virgin into his palm. From his hand away it spun into the sea. "Let her go down," said the indomitable man. The same Romanism said to the bravest and ablest king of France, "Make thyself in the eyes of all men an apostate and hypocrite," and with trembling he obeyed! Raleigh in the tower, Bunyan in Bedford jail, Cervantes in a Spanish galley, were free as no convention could constitute them; and, to testify of it, went forth three works, the *History of the World*, the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the story of *Don Quixote*. Such trophies never followed a Roman conqueror in his triumph. A soul mighty enough transfigures its chains, wears its manacles as a bride her marriage ring, and compels the long succession of after ages to consecrate the tokens of its seeming ignominies with their homage, with their deepest love, and saddest, sweetest tears. There is a crucifixion; and the cross itself ascends into heaven to shine as chief of the constellations for ever.

Thus, certain greatest spirits, having entered into the realm of this higher freedom, found therein all immunities, as the light of all the planets is in the sun. "He affirms" — so the crowned caitiff of Sicily complained of Plato — "that a just man must be happy in the state of slavery, as well as in that of freedom." Nor let us, with Dionysius, fancy the statement inexcusable, though our tongue falter in repeating it. The great soul knew what he was saying, and his words were weighed in a balance such as few minds or times could ever supply. Indeed, he had the opportunity to put them to a practical test; but we do not learn that his deeds disgraced his speech. We behold him bound and borne over the barking seas; but can as soon pity the eternal azure in time of storm, or stars that shine in the cold heaven

upon wintry nights. So Epictetus was a slave, and took a broken limb from the blows of his "master"; his name is now coupled with that of the good emperor, Marcus Antoninus: these were the two last great royal souls of stoicism, and they sail down the stream of time together, monarch ships, majestic still upon that tide whose relentless lips have closed over so many a huge and haughty craft.

These various negations may be thus summed up. The Understanding, which is the victorious subduer and transformer of the visible world, cannot bring man to that freedom which is the goal of all his strivings. The demon is indeed strong and nimble; he will wrestle with the hurricane, and not be overthrown; he will bind Merrimac and Missouri to the crank of his wheels; he will grapple with the lightning and wrench a benefit from its grasp; and the giant forces of nature all succumb to him, who knows the secret of their strength. A true wonder-worker after his kind; but there is a synthesis to be produced in every human breast beyond its most marvellous operation; rough waves to be assuaged, over which its "Peace, be still!" is uttered in vain; a miracle of beauty and blessing among the possibilities of man, which to that is impossible. And he died making no sign of deliverance, a vassal after all his victories, who spoke by its purest inspiration, eloquent words, heard with joy by several ages and nations,—he, the third in rank among English intellects, falsely and flip-pantly named "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind." Man has been away ballooning in the clouds, steaming across oceans, roaming through the heart of mountains, learning the secrets of outward nature, and making the elements his servitors, seeking thus the absolute good, that which is not a means, but an end, not a promise, but an immortal fulfilment of hope and prophecy. Let him now come to himself. In his own bosom is the treasure he seeks. He cannot clutch the sky and draw it down; that remains foreign, unappropriated, and he is an earthling still; but let him enter his own soul, its ever-during sentiments will arch in azure spaces over him, in the still night of contemplation all the stars of thought and slowly sailing constellations will come over the horizon to visit him, and the sun of splendid



purpose ride up the eastern road to make bright the day of action. The long quest is ended; freedom is not a charity which the soul can outwardly receive, but its natural flower, the inflorescence of divine and wondrous energies therein. Without it there may be conquerors, Cræsus, democratic citizens; but without it there can be no hero, no saint, no poet, no man.

Man is primarily a principle of light, or divine activity, involved in an opaque element. Thus the shining orbs of heaven and the sun itself are not compacted of light, but their radiance results from a light-producing energy operating in and upon a dark substratum. We see the same thing in incandescent metal, and otherwise; and one may fancy the time was when this energy had not been evolved, and darkness was on the face of the deep of space. So the Hindoos tell of the sleep of Brahm in the primal night of being, before existence and creation were.

This superior principle is brought down, and, through the concrete being of man, put into organic connection with the blind forces of nature, appetites, inclinations, passions, to prevail over and transform them; that so Light may be ever conquering Darkness, and Freedom subduing Fate. This statement is easily illustrated by a clear analogy, namely, the relation of concrete man to the elemental energies, those, for example, expressed in falling water and expanding steam. He is intelligence, they are strength, and by intelligence he can appropriate them, append them to his hand and will, and so elevate them into the sphere of use. And to impel him to the attainment of this mastery, he is involved in the midst of these forces, made to feel them in his body, made in some respect subject to them; they crowd upon him, overrun him, pinch and affright him, until he penetrates them by his understanding, and so accomplishes the due victory over them. Thus gravitation is in man as well as in the stone; he is coerced into an acquaintance therewith; but when it has been penetrated and mastered by understanding, then it becomes his servitor, the drudging goblin,

“Who in one night, ere glimpse of morn,  
With shadowy flail, hath threshed the corn  
That ten day-laborers could not end.”

Intellectually seen, man is not on the superficies of the world, but in its midst, enveloped by its energies, embraced by its needs. So far as he can see into it, that is, overcome its opacity and make it lucid by the effort of his intelligence, so far its powers become his own, in some sense a subordinate part of himself. The river becomes an extension of his arm, and steam of his steps: by that he clothes and feeds his body, and by this he strides over mountains and seas. Thus he is the Light-principle operating in the world of matter, rendering it translucent to his understanding, and evolving from its cold substance the warm beams of benefit and use.

Carry this analogy into the bosom of man. He is in himself a nascent Love and Reason involved in the midst of hungers, ambitions, and various fateful energies, that he may penetrate their opacity and take them up into the sphere of absolute freedom, beauty, and good. The domination of these forces is the rule of Necessity; his, not harsh repression, but absorption, sweet, loving mastery, and beautiful transfiguration of them, constitutes him God's freeman. Here it is, the old work to be done in these new days, as ever. Here is the alternative not to be avoided, the stint set to every soul born into the world. Nothing can give us escape; nothing can take the task off our hands. It is vain to put our trust in constitutions and ballotings, in all most admirable political forms and finest social arrangements; with awful watch, the serene, all-judging Spirit waits and looks till in each individual being the divine energy penetrates its opaque envelopment, till the pure glow appears in every particle, and darkness is made light in bosom and brain.

We see this process going perpetually on around us. Behold dead gases and dark juices of the earth ascending to become the symmetry of forest forms, the grace of waving boughs, the verdure of leaves, and bloom of petals! Thus rooted in the brain of man, high thoughts and fragrant loves should spring, with a bloom that roses can only prophesy of from afar, and a symmetry that trees can but suggest.

But a fearful fact must not be overlooked, that in man an *inverse* development is possible, wherein though there is light, it is lurid, making a burning darkness, but

not sweet day. The Samson that came to deliver grinds now in the mill of the passions. The forces of fate in the nature ascend not to receive consecration at the hands of Reason, and to sit clothed and in their right mind at the feet of Love, but, abjuring this, drag Intellect down into their cold realm, to mask their desolation with a delusive gleam, and gift with mischievous might their destroying hands. This development is the aim of all insincere and atheistic cultures. And this is the absolute negation of freedom, as opacity is merely the absence of its affirmation. It is not only slavery, but its consecration; the hearty acceptance of Pandemonium as the only true Paradise. It is the gospel of Mephistopheles, much believed, according to which truth is plausibility; good, the satisfaction of greed; and the path of rectitude, whatever may chance to be the readiest road thereto.

Essential Freedom, — the permeation of our whole being by Truth, making its dark substratum the means and material of light. But around this shining orb clouds will cluster, through which it must send its golden arrows as it may. We are surrounded by an element of fate in some degree foreign and beyond our control; which by knowledge may be partly governed, but partly remains intractable, and may sometimes become deadly hostile. Many of these unfriendly agencies a brave man quietly looks out of countenance. So the first settlers of the forest said, that if you met a bear in the path, being unarmed, and without flinching looked him steadily in the eye, he would presently turn aside into the woods. Often our enemies are imaginary, begotten in our apprehensions by the mere arming against enemies; as many a one frightens himself by the bare locking of his doors. But the greatest and bravest soul may at last find himself standing face to face with some deaf minister of fate, which no science can control, nor any nobleness shame, nor any vigor overthrow. For such it only remains to retire into the mountain fastnesses of their manhood, leaving the city of their present fortunes to the foe. Necessity and Free-will then severally conquer on their peculiar planes. But the victory of one is momentary, that of the other eternal; the former a brief eclipse, the latter an everlasting radiance. The

fact soon appears above this illusion of appearance ; and to the sorest seeming defeats of Free-will the world looks back, with reverent and joyful gaze, as the loftiest triumphs.

This conflict between spiritual might and outward oppression appears in all the delineations of tragedy. Tragedy is the apparently vain struggle of a noble will with outward necessity. It is beautiful and attractive, because intrinsically it is victory, though the eye discover only defeat. In Greek literature this picture is most boldly and grandly drawn in the figure of Prometheus chained to his rock. The sharpest wrath of Zeus is spent upon him ;—

“ The thunders crash up with a roar upon roar,  
And red eddies of lightning flash fires in his face ” ;—

and while the hot flood of supernal hate goes over him, he lies naked and helpless, riveted to the rough crag. And yet he is free in defiance of all ; for he continues at one with himself, and his godlike will is not surrendered. Lear, also, a more mixed instance, in the glorious conception of Shakespeare, standing with white locks bared to the storm, and, alas ! with old heart bared too to the poison rain of his daughters' ingratitude, stoops no whit from his kingly height, and will not buy peace with degradation. A purer tragedy than either of these, elevated by the introduction of the saintly element, and which had the splendid advantage of being actual, drew toward the last scenes of its fifth act one morning at Athens, when sad and loving friends gathered around the couch of Socrates, while he rubbed the part that the iron had injured, and talked of alternating pain and pleasure, and of life triumphing over death. And higher raising reverent eyes, we may glance at the sublimest tragedy this planet has seen, that of Judæa ; where a heavenly Will was pressed upon from without, till it was pressed quite over the verge, out of the world, leaving a deathless consecration on the place, and scattering from the cross the seeds of many thousand holy and heroic lives.

The vice of our time is that we make too much of the material and external. We put faith in arrangements and devices, not in spiritual energies. Once, in the ancient indigence of nations, men could be wise only through the birth-throes of intellect, and noble but by



the original strivings and winged ascent of the soul ; but now, grown richer, we have colleges and constitutions, and will compass the great ends of life by the cunning of the understanding. But celestial railroads exist only in the fancy of the satirist and the dream of the simpleton. Coaches may perhaps visit the summit of Mount Washington, but to Olympian heights there is, there will be, no carriage-road, hardly a footpath ; and aspirants, as of old, must stoutly climb, or stay below. And through forgetfulness of these things, there is hot running, but little winning ; and many gain a livelihood, but few live.

D. A. W.

---

ART. III. — DR. CODMAN AND THE SECOND CHURCH  
IN DORCHESTER.\*

NOT till recently has our attention been called to this volume. The character it portrays is worthy of having been drawn by the eminent divines in whose names the book appears. It is just what might be expected from men of their high standing and intimate relations with the subject of it. It is a faithful record of the life of their friend, as it appeared to them, with their means of judging, and their peculiar sympathies and prejudices.

And so far as the general deportment of Dr. Codman, in his domestic and social relations, is concerned, and his earnest zeal and fidelity in the usual walks of his profession, no one at all acquainted with him will presume to question the record. But his character was in part developed by a violent and protracted controversy with a portion of his parish. An enlightened community were greatly interested spectators of the contest, and by no means agreed in their judgment of its merits. The opposing parties, therefore, mostly in their graves, with the pastor, are entitled to regard.

Having been interested in the rise, the course, and the

---

\* *Memoir of John Codman, D. D.*, by WILLIAM ALLEN, D. D., late President of Bowdoin College ; *with Reminiscences*, by JOSHUA BATES, D. D., late President of Middlebury College. Boston : T. R. Marvin and S. K. Whipple & Co. 1853. 12mo. pp. 408.

results of that controversy, we feel called upon to offer some comments on the mode in which it has been rehearsed by Doctors Allen and Bates.

It is much to be regretted that these gentlemen judged it fit to go so minutely into the details of this unhappy affair, and thus create a necessity for bringing again to light things that had better have slept in oblivion; especially as they were never in a situation to present the case in any other than a strong *ex parte* light. Still, they thought it so important to the character of Dr. Codman, and to the interests of their sect, that the account of it occupies thirty-two of the one hundred and fifty-six pages of the Memoir, including a long letter from the late Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton College, New Jersey, who thus interfered to cheer Mr. Codman on in the contest; while sixty-seven of the one hundred and nineteen pages of the Reminiscences have a bearing, direct or indirect, upon it. In the account here given of it, the main object of his biographers was, to commend Mr. Codman at the expense of his parishioners; that portion of them, at least, whom he could not proselyte to his creed, or bend to his will. He is uniformly praised and extolled; they are as uniformly blamed and condemned.

Fortunately, the printed documents pertaining to the origin and early transactions of the Second Parish in Dorchester furnish ample testimony, from which the candid reader may form a correct opinion in the case. To these we shall have occasion to refer, as we proceed. And by following the line of the narrative, the volume before us will enable us to do equal justice to Dr. Codman.

He was a son of the Hon. John Codman, one of the most wealthy and respectable merchants of Boston, and a member of the Brattle Street Society. His fitting for College was partly at Andover Academy, and partly under the care of the late Professor Ware, Sen., then minister of Hingham. He graduated at Harvard, with a good reputation, in the memorable class of 1802. After leaving College, he studied law nearly a year, in the office of the late John Lowell, Esq. But the sudden death of his father, who "in his last sickness intimated a wish that his son should become a minister of the Gospel," "was the means of changing his profession." "He

commenced the study of theology in 1803, with his early instructor, Rev. Henry Ware, with whom he remained about a year, and then removed to Cambridge, there to continue his theological pursuits.\* There "he formed a particular intimacy with several students and preachers of Evangelical sentiments." This, it seems, was "congenial society" to Mr. Codman, for he was, doubtless, strongly predisposed to Calvinism, and he then adopted those views of theology.

In the summer of 1805 he embarked for Europe, with the view of finishing his studies in Scotland. After remaining there nearly two years, "he left Edinburgh. At Bristol he obtained a license to preach. He was soon invited to preach in the Scotch church, in Swallow Street, London, where he continued his labors for about a year. Returning home in 1808, he arrived at Boston in the month of May."† He had been flattered abroad, and came home with high expectations. He preached from memory, used much gesture, and wore his hair powdered and tastefully dressed; his manner was solemn and earnest. It is not strange, therefore, that Mr. Codman should have drawn the attention of the new parish in Dorchester, who were then ready to settle a minister. After preaching there on two Sundays, and at a preparatory lecture, in September of that year, the church gave him a unanimous call, and the parish accorded with only four dissenting votes. Before giving his answer, Mr. Codman, with great apparent fairness, addressed a letter to the parish committee on the subject of his religious opinions.

"Lest there should be a doubt,"‡ he says, "in the mind of any one upon this subject, I think it my duty, in the presence of a heart-searching God, to declare my firm, unshaken faith in those doctrines that are sometimes called the doctrines of the Reformation, the doctrines of the cross, the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel. These doctrines, through the help of God, I intend to preach; in the faith of these doctrines I hope to live; and in the faith of these doctrines I hope to die.

"It gives me great pleasure to have it in my power to say that I believe my faith is the same with that of our venerable forefathers, and particularly with that of the former pastors of the church of Dorchester.

"As Arian and Socinian errors have of late crept into some

---

\* *Memoir*, p. 23.† *Ibid.*, p. 68.‡ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

of our churches, I think it my duty to declare to that church of Christ, of whom I may have the pastoral charge, that I believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be the one living and true God, and that my faith in general is conformable to the Assembly's Catechism, and to the Confession of Faith drawn up by the Elders and Messengers of the Congregational churches in the year 1680, and recommended to the churches by the General Court of Massachusetts."

This is all the avowal Mr. Codman made of his sentiments, before accepting the call. And it deserves special notice, because he made it, from the first, the sole ground of his justification of the exclusive measures he adopted respecting his pulpit exchanges, which we expect to show was the true and only cause of the controversy.

Mr. Codman always took to himself great credit, and his friends claimed it for him, that he was so *full, particular, and explicit* in this avowal. That he stated most *fairly and distinctly* the doctrines he intended to preach. And yet it will be seen, by a glance at his statement, that only one doctrine is there distinctly specified. In the most general manner he tells the parish, "The doctrines of the Reformation, the doctrines of the cross, the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel, through the help of God, I intend to preach. . . . I believe my faith is the same with that of our venerable forefathers, and particularly the former pastors of the church in Dorchester, . . . and in general is conformable to the Assembly's Catechism," &c., &c.

But if it had been ever so *full and particular*, the statement would have been wholly needless. The church and society well knew he was a Calvinist and gave him a call as such, expecting and desiring, to a man, as will be shown, that he would do as other Calvinistic ministers up to that time had freely done,—exchange with neighboring ministers of liberal sentiments. And if Mr. Codman had candidly avowed the resolve, already made up in his mind, as in honor and conscience he was bound to do, not to exchange with them,—we speak from an intimate and thorough knowledge of persons and their views on the subject, and of the discussion of the question then going on in the parish,—he could not have had a vote, not a single one, to settle with them. This we think is evident from the reply of the parish to his avowal of sentiments. It is fairly met and answered,



and the course they wished him to pursue is clearly pointed out, in the letter of their committee, dated October 31, 1808.

From this there is an extract in the *Memoirs*,\* to which we shall make an addition. They begin by saying:—

“Although there may be a difference in opinion among us respecting some parts of the Holy Scriptures, your communication is received with pleasure and general satisfaction, and we venerate the principles of our forefathers, especially the pious and worthy pastors of the church in Dorchester, and are happy to find you agree with them in sentiment.

“We are sensible that the office of a minister of the Gospel is in the highest degree important and responsible, but if you accept that office and we are the people of your charge, we hope it will not be rendered difficult or unpleasant by the want of candor or propriety of conduct on our part, and that no root of bitterness will spring up to trouble us.

“In our present imperfect state, various opinions and discordant sentiments will exist, and occasions occur for the exercise of a spirit of condescension, patience, and toleration. This spirit we wish to cultivate, as we all acknowledge the same Great Head of the Church, and in him are all brethren, and if we follow his example shall be all friends.

“A general unanimity and spirit of accommodation, we hope, will continue among us, and should you accept our call to the important duties of a Gospel minister, we have no doubt but you will use your endeavors to promote peace and friendship among the people of your charge, and to continue and confirm it among our sister churches and their pastors, and the University, of which you will be an overseer.”

The document from which this is extracted “was unanimously approved at a parish meeting,” and clearly enough shows the wishes and expectations of the church and society, at the time, respecting the conduct of their minister, in his intercourse with the neighboring societies and their ministers.

But this is not all. In the letter which contains the avowal of his sentiments, Mr. Codman asked the favor of the church and society “to use Dr. Watts’s Psalms and Hymns,” instead of Belknap’s, then in use; and “that they would grant him the use of the porch, back of the pulpit, for a vestry.”

---

\* Page 71.

With these requests the parish complied. The proposal to change the hymn-books, however, was met with reluctance, and caused much sensation and discussion as to what it indicated. *Fears and doubts were freely expressed*, "whether Mr. Codman would exchange with the Boston Association of Ministers generally," and "with such ministers as they were accustomed to hear."

Accordingly, several influential members of the church and of the society waited on him, in a friendly way, to converse with him on the subject. In these conversations, by different men, and at different times, the state of feeling in regard to exchanges was distinctly made known to him. He was positively assured that the parish would not be *satisfied*, and that it would be the cause of *trouble*, — we speak now from personal knowledge of facts, — if they should be disappointed in this particular.

Mr. Codman cautiously refrained from committing himself directly on the subject, and yet managed so plausibly as to satisfy those gentlemen — they told us so at the time — that he should exchange agreeably to their wishes. He assured them of his intention to join the "Boston Association of Ministers" immediately, — which he did soon after his ordination, — and that "he meant to be upon the most intimate terms of friendship with them." He said some very kind things of Mr. Harris, the minister of the First Church.

The depositions of some of those gentlemen were taken, and are in print, with the other documents pertaining to the history of the parish. "Mr. Codman's conversation gave them satisfaction on that subject," they said; and "the impression made on their minds was such, as induced them to believe that all difficulties would be removed with those who were apprehensive that he would not exchange ministerial labors with the Boston Association of Ministers."

This no doubt was the case. For preparations were forthwith made, with unusual harmony, for the ordination, which took place on the 7th of December, 1808, the sermon being preached by the Rev. W. E. Channing.

But how are we to reconcile this wily shyness — we cannot help calling it so — on the subject of exchanges, with Mr. Codman's professed frankness of disposition, and his anxiety to prevent future difficulties and misun-

derstandings, so earnestly expressed in his letter to the parish respecting his religious opinions? He well knew the intimate relations subsisting between his church and the neighboring churches, and the united and earnest desire and expectation of the parish, that those relations would be kept up by exchanges, as before, with the pastors of those churches. But at the time he gave his answer, as the writer of the *Reminiscences* admits, he had otherwise resolved. He says: \* "Mr. Codman seems early to have formed the resolution of keeping himself free from the entanglement and perplexity of promiscuous exchanges. Accordingly he intimated his intention, in the most delicate manner, to some of his confidential friends." "When called, therefore, to settle in Dorchester, he acted consistently with these views, and with reference to this fixed determination." The same is evident from the letter of Dr. Miller: † "I hope and believe, my dear brother, from what I hear, that you are determined, whatever may occur, to adhere to your original resolution respecting EXCHANGES with ministers of heterodox or doubtful sentiments." And yet this was kept secret from the confiding people who had called him to be their minister. Comment is not here needed, and we shall make none.

Here we insert an extract from the *Right Hand of Fellowship*, by Mr. Harris, at Mr. Codman's ordination; because it gives, in few words, the true character and condition of the Second Parish, and amply refutes the sad account of the churches and the ministry by the author of the *Reminiscences*. For the state of religion in Boston and the other neighboring towns was not materially different from that in Dorchester.

The closing paragraphs of the extract are given in the *Memoir*, ‡ not indeed to praise, but rather with a sneer.

"For many years have the inhabitants of this town been remarkable for their devout observance of the Lord's day, and regular attendance upon the duties of the sanctuary; and before the recent separation were considered as forming one of the largest assemblies of religious worshippers, with the greatest number of communicants, of any in the vicinity. Then, and through the whole transaction of gathering a new church and

\* *Memoir*, pp. 183, 184.

† *Ibid.*, p. 101.

‡ Page 82.

forming a second society, a *Christian spirit of love and harmony* has been evinced, of which, perhaps, there is no fairer instance in the ecclesiastical history of our country."

"Standing fast in one spirit, and striving together for *the faith of the Gospel*, they have paid little attention to lesser matters, and words of doubtful disputation, and have been indoctrinated rather in those *important truths of religion* in which all agree, than in those *speculative topics*, about which so many differ. The modern distinctions of sect and party are scarcely known, and have *never been advocated among them*. To be *disciples and followers of the Lord Jesus*, has been their only endeavor; and to be called **CHRISTIANS**, the only appellation by which they have *aimed or desired* to be distinguished.

"Enter, MY BROTHER, into these my labors. In this portion of the vineyard may you find the vines flourishing, and the clusters fair, and gather fruit unto everlasting life."

Fifty years ago, we may here remark, the late Dr. Harris was the greatly beloved minister of the whole town of Dorchester, including the Neck, now known as South Boston.

We wish our limits would allow us to make free extracts from the interesting documents in print, relating to the history of the Second Parish, to show the reluctance with which they parted from Mr. Harris, and their earnest desire to keep peace in the town.

Suffice it to say, new accommodations were greatly needed. The first recorded movement thereto, August 4, 1804, was the calling of a town-meeting, "to see if the town will build a meeting-house in the southerly part of the town, and settle another minister." This, and a like attempt some months after, failed. A company of seventy-two persons then united for the object, who declared in the outset, that they "wished and meant to do nothing which may give a reasonable cause of uneasiness; but should strive as much as possible to cultivate peace and friendship with all their fellow-townsmen."

The house having been built, it was dedicated October 30, 1806. On the 25th of November following, the proprietors called another town-meeting. On that occasion a committee of the proprietors presented their views to the town, in a document of much interest.

The main proposal of it was, that "the town should



agree to pay two ministers out of the public income, as is the case with our schoolmasters," taking the control of the meeting-house, so that they might be a branch of the parent society, and not a separate parish. In their address, the committee speak of it as a "painful reflection, that the measure must in some degree deprive them of the services of their worthy minister, Mr. Harris, and regret that it must separate them from their worthy and respected friends in the church and congregation, with whom they have long lived in habits of intimacy and union of sentiments, in a degree far beyond what religious societies often experience." And again, "We have one settled minister, in whom all are satisfied." On mature deliberation, however, it was thought best that a new church and society should be organized.

Accordingly, sixty-four members petitioned for a dissolution of their relation, which was granted December 21, 1807. In their farewell address they say : —

"We have in every stage of this important business expressed our reluctance to complete separation. That it is now to take place is a painful consideration ; but we yield to it with sincere desires that we may be one in brotherly love and charity, though separated in place of public worship.

"And we now request that you would entertain towards us the pleasant intercourse which belongs to the communion of churches. God forbid that we should sin against the Lord, in ceasing to pray for you and your spiritual instructor, whom we bear on our hearts with the highest esteem, and separate from with the deepest regret."

We make a brief extract from the reply of the parent church : —

"In yielding to your request for a dissolution of your immediate relation to us, we reciprocate the tender and affecting sentiments with which that application was accompanied, and assure you of our good-will and cordial affection, which many considerations have served to strengthen ; and we would be far from considering that the kind regards which these have produced are alienated, or even diminished, by the separation which now takes place."

We may also remark, that this enterprise was carried on wholly under *Liberal* or Unitarian auspices. The Rev. Dr. Porter of Roxbury, and the Rev. Mr. Pierce of Brookline, were invited to assist Mr. Harris in the dedi-

cation of the meeting-house. And the house was *dedicated* "to the glory of God in the services of Christian worship." \* It was not "DEDICATED TO THE TRIUNE GOD."

At the gathering of the Second Church, the Rev. Dr. Lathrop of the Second Church in Boston, Dr. Porter and the Rev. Mr. Gray of Roxbury, and the Rev. Mr. Pierce of Brookline, with the Rev. Mr. Harris, were convened as a council to solemnize the transaction, January 1, 1808.

The sermon on that occasion, by Mr. Pierce, and the Right Hand of Fellowship, by Dr. Porter, recognize "the wonderful unanimity, zeal, and success, and the decency and propriety, order and charity with which they had conducted their affairs to that issue." Dr. Porter also reminded them of "the harmony and friendly intercourse which had for many years subsisted among the churches of that neighborhood, as well as among their respective pastors," and expressed "a confidence that they would not be wanting in their disposition and endeavors, that peace and friendship might continue and abound."

Of the council which ordained Mr. Codman, nine ministers out of twelve were members of the Boston Association, and all who performed the parts on the occasion, save the venerable Dr. Eckly, of the Old South, were *liberal* in sentiment. Dr. Eckly himself, in temper and conduct, was one of the most liberal, though a Calvinist in opinion. To the end of his ministry he continued to exchange with the Unitarians of his Association, and could not be made to join the unholy band to break up *the peace of Jerusalem*.

We could bring much more documentary evidence to show, that, up to the time of Mr. Codman's ordination, peace and brotherly love and Christian fellowship prevailed in Dorchester, and the region round about. All the difficult concerns of placing and building a church edifice, of their church and parish organizations, and the adjustment of church and parish property, had been managed with as much union and harmony as if there had been but one mind to plan and one hand to execute. In less than one short year, however, all was uproar and confusion in this hitherto quiet parish and town, and

---

\* Mr. Harris's Dedication Sermon, p. 15.

jarring sounds were heard in the neighboring parishes. And now the question comes, What spirit of discord was it that now first broke peace, and peace till then unbroken? What was the cause of this disorder and discontent? Let those immediately concerned answer the question. An address was presented to Mr. Codman, dated November 10, 1809, — eleven months after his ordination, — from which we extract the following.

“We your parishioners with diffidence address you on a subject which we think a very important one.” After alluding to the *serious evils*, social and domestic, with which dissensions between ministers and their people are fraught, and which “they have all witnessed near at home,” they go on to say: —

“We do not *presume*, neither have we a *wish*, to prescribe what doctrine would be most congenial to our feelings to hear from you; but are willing you should exercise your own opinion. But the principal object we have in view, at this time, is to represent to you, that there is a dissatisfaction and uneasiness in the parish, which appears to be daily increasing. The principal cause of which, we apprehend, arises from a disappointment that many of your parishioners feel, from your not making your exchanges *generally* with those ministers who preach the public lectures in Boston, on Thursdays, and with them indiscriminately. This we did expect, and this we think we have a just claim to expect, from your own observations, previous to your being settled as our minister.”

This was signed by forty members of the parish, and approved by others, who chose not to sign it. The following is the substance of Mr. Codman's reply: —

“With regard to *the principal object*, which you profess to have in view at *this time*, you must give me leave to say, that I never can, nor never shall, PLEDGE myself to exchange pulpits with any man or body of men whatever; and that I never did, from any observations previous to my being settled as your minister, give you any just claim to expect it.”

Things now went on fast from bad to worse in the parish. We can touch upon only a few points in the controversy, in the order of events, for it bristled with points on all sides, sharp and barbed. At the annual parish-meeting in April, 1810, an article relating to Mr. Codman's exchanges was brought up, but no direct action was taken on the subject.

At a special meeting, October 8, 1810, the parish passed a vote, "That the Rev. Mr. Codman be requested to exchange with the ministers who compose the Boston Association, of which he is a member"; and chose a committee of thirteen "to wait on him, for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, a definite answer, whether he will, or will not, comply with our sincere wishes in the above request."

The committee attended that service, and at an adjourned meeting, October 22d, reported the usual answer from Mr. Codman, — "That he cannot pledge himself to exchange with any man, or any body of men, whatever." Whereupon it was voted, by forty to thirty-five, —

"That the parish regret the Rev. Mr. Codman's not complying with their request, by giving them a decided answer in the affirmative, which would, in their opinion, have restored their former peace and harmony; — that they most ardently wish to be on terms of amity and friendship with the reverend gentlemen composing the Boston Association, and the churches immediately under their care. But if his principles are such, that he cannot comply with our request, which we conceive all-important to our future peace and prosperity, that the connection between him and us become extinct."

Mutual confidence was now lost, and moderation and decorum were scarcely preserved by either party.

On the 24th of June, 1811, a parish-meeting was called, and a committee chosen to confer with Mr. Codman, authorized to request him to ask a dismissal from them; but should he not comply with the request, to propose to him to join in calling a mutual council, to hear and determine on all matters of controversy between him and the society. And in case of his not acceding to either of these propositions, the committee were directed to proceed immediately to the choice of an *ex parte* council.

After much delay, the parties agreed on calling a mutual ecclesiastical council. It is painful to read the tedious correspondence of several intervening months, conducted much more in the style of adroit and subtile politicians than of meek and humble Christians. Through the whole of it, Mr. Codman labors to evade the matter of exchanges, as not admissible in the case; and persists



in regarding the "full and particular statement of his views and belief respecting the doctrines of the Gospel," before his settlement, as sufficient to justify his course, and satisfy his opponents.

At length a council, composed of twelve ministers, each with a delegate, convened at Dorchester, October 30, 1811. After a deliberation of more than a week, they were equally divided on the main article of complaint laid before them.

Nothing was gained, therefore, by this measure. And in less than a month, measures were in train for calling another council. And it was agreed to invite eight ministers, each with a delegate, and the venerable Dr. Joseph Lathrop, of West Springfield, without a delegate, to be moderator and umpire.

This council met May 12, 1812. To them "the parties mutually agreed to submit unconditionally, — whether it is expedient and necessary that the Rev. Mr. Codman's ministerial relation to the parish be dissolved."

On this question the council was equally divided; and the Rev. Moderator decided the vote in the negative, with the following explanation: —

"I gave my vote in the negative, on a full belief and strong persuasion, that, from this time forward, he would open a more free and liberal intercourse with his ministerial brethren; and thus remove the only objection alleged against him, and the only reason urged for his dismission. If his future conduct should be the same as in time past in this respect, I should be much disappointed and grieved; and should certainly have no hesitancy in giving my vote for his dismission, if called in Providence to give my voice on the question."

At the end of six months, it did not appear that Mr. Codman had complied, or meant to comply, with the spirit and intent of this result. With two exceptions, he had not exchanged with those ministers whom his parish wished to hear. He had uniformly insisted, that he could not in conscience exchange with them. In fact, matters had gone much too far for a reconciliation, on any terms with which he could be expected to comply. Accordingly, a meeting of the parish was called, November 24, 1812. A committee was chosen to wait on Mr. Codman, and in the name of the parish to renew the

request that he would ask a dismission. On his refusal to comply, it was voted, that

“Whereas the Rev. John Codman has refused to comply with the reasonable wish and request of the parish for him to ask a dismission, — and whereas, in the opinion of the parish, he has forfeited his office, — therefore voted, that the ministerial and pastoral relation and connection between him and the parish be extinct from and after Thursday next; and that the parish will not allow him to preach in their meeting-house, nor pay him any salary, after that time.”

This was not meant to be a decisive measure, but merely to get the case before a civil tribunal. On the Sunday following, another minister was engaged to occupy the pulpit, and Mr. Codman was forcibly excluded therefrom. Such a step was not needed, nor was it politic, or any way justifiable. Public sentiment evidently was shocked by it; and we have always supposed the active leaders in it had misgivings as to the propriety of it, though they were resolved to persevere. Happily, however, before another Sunday an agreement was made that Mr. Codman's friends should purchase all the pews in the meeting-house, at cost, that should be offered them in sixty days, by persons dissatisfied with Mr. Codman, “on condition that they take no part in parish affairs, so long as Mr. Codman shall be the minister of the parish.”

The next year, 1813, the seceders from the Second Parish built a meeting-house at the village, and formed the society now under the charge of the Rev. Mr. Pike.

Thus ended this needless and pernicious controversy. From the beginning, the opponents of Mr. Codman had the RIGHT of the case. It has never been denied, it could not be, that he introduced a new order of things respecting pulpit exchanges. And it is quite as evident, that this was contrary to the unanimous desires and expectations of the parish at the time he was settled, — desires and expectations carefully and plainly made known to him.

And now we must ask, What excuse can be framed for him in keeping them in utter ignorance, — nay, misleading, deceiving, them in this vital point? In view of the importance he attached to his peculiar doctrines, and his known aversion to the heresies of the day, we

submit whether it was consistent, — whether it was honest and Christian, — to allow himself, in silence, to be ordained by ministers well known by him to be greatly beloved by all his parish, yet with whom he had then resolved not to exchange, and could not afterwards be induced to exchange?

But it must be confessed and regretted, this good cause was not managed in the best way. Had the opposition been patient, and acted with a wise discretion, they might have kept the parish united on the subject of exchanges. There were among the leaders some wealthy men, as resolute and as obstinate as Mr. Codman, though not as artful and politic as he, who said and did rash things, which injured their cause abroad, and gave offence to the more staid part of the parish, and in fact forced some of the most liberal-minded to side with the pastor. Still, the opposition, without a remembered exception, were a church-going and a minister-loving people. And if the pastor had shown any disposition to conciliate, — if he had in good faith consented to make one half of his exchanges with their old friends, — and this they had actually calculated upon, — earnest, solemn Calvinism might have been preached the rest of the time, provided it had been free from denunciation and abuse, without breaking the peace of the parish, or lessening their regard for the pastor. But Mr. Codman was not conciliatory. He was naturally fond of power, and could not brook opposition. He had taken his ground, and was resolved to maintain it, — uncompromising warfare against the popular heresies.

His policy from the first doubtless was, to keep all the liberal ministers from being heard, and in every possible way to make their sentiments odious to his people, and thus to reconcile them to that policy. The ministers were freely denounced from the pulpit. As he gained the confidence of his people, and as occasion offered in his private intercourse, he did not shun to acquaint them with the heresies of the neighboring ministers, and in this way succeeded, we are sorry to *know*, in prejudicing some of the most liberal-minded against them. In a word, the ministrations of Mr. Codman were, in most respects, the exact opposite of those to which his people had been used. Many of his exchanges were with men

they had not known. And in making his selection, he *seemed* to choose the most violent partisans. To a great extent, his was rather a ministry of *denunciation*, than the direct inculcation of doctrines. Moreover, he had a strange fancy of the *need* of opposition. He once said to us during the controversy, that "he should not think his preaching was doing any good if it did not meet opposition."

We could go on to fill many pages with vivid recollections from our own experience, to show the headstrong party zeal with which Mr. Codman's ministry was conducted. We have admitted the impatient rashness of the opposition. But when we call to mind the whole case in all its bearings, so great was their disappointment, and so great the contrast to which they were subjected, we incline rather to wonder that they bore the infliction so well.

We have treated the matter thus far, as it relates to the parties directly concerned, as simply a *quarrel* of Mr. Codman with his parish about exchanges. And we have aimed to give a clear and connected view of the subject, as shown by documents referred to, or as it passed under our own observation, to rectify the *ex parte* aspect of it as presented by his biographers. And here we should stop.

But the volume before us has shown so much skill in attempting to find the true cause of this controversy out of the limits of Dorchester, and has bestowed such a reach of thought to fit it to a peculiar state of the churches at large, that we beg indulgence for a few moments more.

To suit the cause of party, the records of Mr. Codman's parish are set aside. Their constant disavowal of other causes of complaint, and the obvious fact that the charge relating to exchanges was the one mainly relied on before two successive councils, are overlooked, and conjecture is set to work to find an adequate cause. The *Memoir* says:—

"The origin of these difficulties cannot be explained, except by a declension among the people from the faith of the primitive Christians of Dorchester, and of the first settlers of New England."—p. 81.

The author of the *Reminiscences* seems determined to



have a cause of his own for the Dorchester troubles. He says :—

“ The subject of exchanges was, in my apprehension, merely incidental and subservient to the true cause. It was made, at last, by the continual pressure of an influence beyond the limits of the parish, the *ostensible* ground of the whole opposition.” — p. 186.

Again :—

“ But, as intimated, the cause of the opposition to Mr. Codman was, originally, very far from this subject of exchanges, as those who were near enough to see its rise and observe its progress well knew. To us it was perfectly evident that the pungent preaching, the full and clear exhibition of the humbling doctrines of the Gospel, was the first great moving cause of the opposition.” — p. 187.

And again :—

“ These causes, therefore,—the subjects of his preaching, the manner of his preaching, the frequency and urgent application of his preaching, rather than the fact that he neglected to exchange with some of the Boston ministers,—were most evidently the original causes, and lay at the foundation of the opposition. The course which he adopted in regulating his pulpit exchanges, as a plausible ground of complaint, seems to have been with his opposers an afterthought, probably suggested from without.” — p. 190.

But “ the whole difficulty involved in the Dorchester controversy grew out of the peculiar condition of the churches and the ministry in that region ”; viz. “ a departure from the faith of the primitive fathers of New England.” (p. 173.)

“ Whatever may have been the causes, immediate or remote, the state of religion at that period was exceedingly low in all the northern portions of our country, and especially in that portion of it concerning which I am now writing. The Congregational churches in the vicinity of Boston were feeble, and their members few in number. Few came to the solemn feasts of Christianity ; and those few were of a mixed character, and of various and heterogeneous sentiments. This was the state of the Congregational churches, with few exceptions, at this period, through all the region (and in some cases beyond that region) which embraced the churches connected with the Boston Association of Congregational Ministers. And the state of the ministry itself was not much better. The Scripture

adage might with great propriety be applied to the case, — ‘Like people, like priests.’” — p. 179.

And yet, notwithstanding this and many pages of like fancy painting, we are happy to know that, up to the time of the Dorchester controversy, the Rev. Dr. Bates freely exchanged — sought exchanges — with those very ministers; and, what is stranger still, was heard with great satisfaction by the “*heterogeneous and discordant*” members of their several congregations.

The account given by Dr. Harris of the state of the churches in this neighborhood, in his Right Hand of Fellowship at Mr. Codman’s ordination, from which we have quoted, better accords with our own recollections than the Reminiscences of Dr. Bates. At any rate, “*feeble churches and divided churches*” were not heard of till after the controversy in question. They were the fruitful results, and not the cause, of that and like unholy controversies.

We close with expressing the confident belief, that, if Mr. Codman had foregone the ambition of being a party leader or a party instrument, and left the cause of party strife to other hands, — if he had yielded to the well-founded wishes and expectations of his people in regard to exchanges, and limited his efforts more to the best interests of his whole parish and town, — his Calvinism to the contrary notwithstanding, he might have made himself one of the most useful and beloved of ministers. If he reached the object of his wishes in the course he pursued, he earned also the fame, not to be envied, of having broken up and divided one of the most united and happy and hopeful parishes, and scattered all the evils of *religious* discord far and wide.

Our brethren in the other portion of the divided fold of Congregationalism often charge upon us the strife and injustice that attended the controversy opened half a century ago. We commend unto their candor this fair question: Should a Christian society, after building a church in which they hoped to listen to ministers who had taught them from their infancy, be expected to be debarred from this privilege, and be compelled to hear those same ministers denounced, because one whom they had called to be their pastor had *secretly* resolved to pursue this exclusive course?

L. C.

## ART. IV. — CHURCH MUSIC.

It is not our intention to essay the interminable task of reviewing the various books of church music which have been published since the last article upon the subject appeared upon these pages. The task were not only interminable and valueless, but would require a knowledge of the technicalities of music to which we lay no claim. We propose to speak of church music upon that side only upon which all men of culture and taste are able to judge of it, — the side of Art.

The definition of Art given by Charles H. Goddard is the only one which satisfies us, that Art is the truth embodying itself for the mere sake of embodiment. Thus many of the ancient tongues, with deeper truth than the Greek, call poets by some name which implies that they are unconscious agents in the hands of a higher power. Thus also the Scripture speaks of a heathen sculptor as acting in his art under the direct inspiration of the true God. The Greeks called the poet a creator, which is but part of the truth; the Hebrews, the Latins, and others, gave more of the truth in calling the poet one *through whom* a creation is made, or through whom a saying is uttered.

The true artist hides himself utterly, not by an effort to conceal himself, but by such a perfect surrender of himself to the truth which he would embody, that he forgets himself, and, as it were, becomes that which he would express. If he is a true artist, he is a true prophet; that is to say, an utterer of divine truth without will of his own, his will being identified with the truth which he would utter. So far as an artist is conscious of labor and of plan and effort, he is not a true artist, but only an artificer.

The first and most natural utterance by man is through the medium of words. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. But there are also other modes of expression, natural or naturally inverted; and the definition of art which we adopted will cover them all. Whatever expression a true and healthful state of the soul naturally employs, that expression which is a necessitated, harmonious, self-ruled, and self-bounded expres-

sion, is art. So that dancing, sculpture, music, and painting belong, with poetry, to the service of God, and it is sacrilege to use either of them in unhallowed modes. In the reign of that great poet and musician, under whom the Jewish state made most rapid progress, we know that all of them, unless we except painting, were used in the service of the temple, or at least in religious services in the presence of the sacred ark of the covenant.

Poetry embraces in itself all art, because it is through words alone that we have a universal medium of expression. Dancing is the most limited of arts, because expression through the medium of motion is most limited, confined to the moment and the place. No art can be founded upon smelling and tasting, and probably none upon simple coloring, because we have no means of expressing ourselves through them, or allowing the truth to express itself through us by them.

Following our imperfect remembrance of the lecture to which we have referred, we might say that Sculpture is the art in which truth expresses itself through the tangible, Painting that in which it expresses itself through the visible. These two arts are limited in space, Sculpture in all three directions, Painting in two, having unlimited distance. Music is the art in which the truth expresses itself through tones. It is therefore unlimited in space, but limited, in time, to the present. But as there is time in the soul's life, as there is always a now to the soul, even when there is not a here, Music is practically as free from the limitations of space and time as Poetry herself, and is therefore the only art that can properly be "married to immortal verse."

Music is, however, limited in the range of its subjects. It is only emotions of the soul itself that can be expressed by tones. What is called descriptive music is not really art, but artifice; not the involuntary flow of the thought or emotion into sound, but a studied attempt to imitate. It bears the same relation to true music that waxwork does to sculpture, or that the copying of minute details in drawing does to painting. If descriptive music were to be accounted true music, then that artist would be greatest who should invent new instruments whereby noises could be produced like those of nature, the crackling of flames, the rustling of leaves, the roaring of waves, or the crash of the thunder.



It cannot, of course, be denied that true music is often descriptive. But this is an accidental accompaniment of the true effect. Thus in Haydn's music the scenes of nature are often presented to us in vivid coloring. But this happens simply because the music expresses emotions of such character and in such combinations as are usually excited only by certain natural scenes, and is a very different thing from the artifice of representing by rhythm, pitch, melody, and selection of instruments, the noises natural to the scene which is sought to be portrayed.

The true artist is one who seizes upon, or rather is seized by, the central idea, and through whom that idea develops itself in a true and perfect manner. Let the passage of the Red Sea, for instance, present itself in all its historic and mystic grandeur to an artistic soul. If he be a poet, he can disregard time and space, and in his portraiture of the scene present to us the whole exodus, with its interest culminating at the moment when the remorseless waves closed over the tyrant's host, and ransomed Israel was out of Pharaoh's power. If he be a sculptor, he must renounce the theme, for his art cannot go beyond representing one or two of the principal actors, and those only at the moments when they paused at the water's brink. If he be a painter, he must be limited to some single moment in the history, and to a single point of view; but he can express upon his canvas the whole scene at that point of time and of place. And if his painting be worthy of the theme, it will all be subordinate to the great thoughts and feelings of that moment. He will not spend any more thought upon the trappings of the Egyptian horses, nor upon the rocks and sea-weeds at the water's edge, than is necessary in order to make them add to the general effect of the scene. If he be a musician, he can, like the poet, range over the whole time of the exodus; but it will only be in expressing the feelings of the actors, or of himself as spectator. If he leaves this, and endeavors by artifice of rhythm and instrumentation to represent the tramp of the cavalry, the dashing of the waves, the inarticulate shrieks of the drowning Egyptians, he is like the painter who should bestow disproportionate labor upon the painting of the horses' legs, the foam of the sea, and the floating bodies

of the dead, to the neglect of the faces and attitudes of the living actors and spectators of the scene, in whom, of course, the interest of the whole event centres.

Music, more nearly than the other arts, will endure the limitation of that older definition of poetry, that it is the language of passion or emotion. And it will fill this definition with the most wonderful completeness. No innocent or holy state of heart but may be expressed in music with the most perfect definiteness and nicety of shades in the expression. All men feel this. The only difficulty lies in determining what it is that constitutes the expressive part of music. Is it in the melody, the harmony, the instrumentation, the dynamic variations, the key, — is it in any or all of these? The safest answer may perhaps be to say, that it lies in all these things combined, and perhaps combined with others not named. Nevertheless this is not the answer which we shall make. We affirm that the expression is given by the melody, that is, that the melody embodies the emotion which seeks expression in the music, and that the key, the harmony, the instrumentation, and the dynamic variations are necessitated or required by the melody. Every varying state of emotion in the human heart could sing itself in a certain melody, if that particular state of feeling were awakened in a musician's soul. And that melody would have its appropriate harmony, so that an attempt to harmonize it in different modes would always detract more or less from the beauty and power of the whole.

On the other hand, every true melody is the expression of a certain definite state of feeling, and on that account requires a key, a time, and a harmony in accordance with that feeling. The melody consists in the rhythmical construction, and in the succession of musical intervals. It may be played in the slowest or the quickest time, without giving it a new expression. A false time simply injures the expression of the melody, giving it the effect of travesty or of burlesque.

Every tune is then the expression of a definite state of feeling, the utterance of certain emotions. That is a false view of music which supposes that the emotions are wholly in the hearer's mind, and differ in every hearer. It may be that "nature wears the hues of the spirit,"

and that different hearers will put a different interpretation upon the same piece of music, according to the frame of their own feelings. But this will be by the violence which they do the music, and not from the indefiniteness of its expression. A man cannot understand a poem which utters sentiments wholly above the region of his thoughts. And in like manner a man cannot understand the expression of music which utters emotions to which he is a stranger. Any man who has ever felt the sentiment embodied in the music will perceive that the music utters it; any man who has never felt it will either think the music meaningless, or attribute to it some lower emotion of a kindred character.

But in our religious congregations we suppose that at least a large proportion of the hearers are capable of feeling religious emotions, and that they will, to a greater or less degree, be impressed by the character of religious music. The congregation assemble, and the voluntary puts them more or less perfectly into the same state of feeling with the organist who composed it. Next, in the order of services, a hymn is, perhaps, to be sung. It may, or may not, be in accordance with the spirit of the voluntary. But this is, provided the voluntary was religious in its character, a matter of small importance. The choice of a tune for the hymn is, however, an important and difficult matter. The chorister must be able to sympathize with the writer of the hymn, so as to understand the spirit which it breathes; and he must then run in his mind's eye over the list of melodies with which his choir are conversant, and decide upon that one whose spirit most nearly coincides with that of the hymn. If he does this well, he has fulfilled by far the most important part of his work. It is of comparatively little importance whether the choir do or do not keep perfect tune and perfect time; whether they do or do not swell and diminish the volume of sound in such way as to bring out most fully the meaning of the melody; whether they are or are not well balanced as to the relative strength of the parts. If in all these respects the choir is perfect, so much the better; if it is defective, the defects must be unusually great to destroy the effect of a good hymn sung to an appropriate melody. But if a tune is chosen wholly inappropriate to the hymn, no excellence

of execution can atone for the defect. We may easily prove this to the satisfaction of the most fastidious ear by supposing an extreme case. The air of Handel, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and the Scotch melody of "Maggie Lawder," are both expressive of joy and confidence. But the one is expressive of unshaken religious confidence and religious joy; the other of a self-confident and reckless assurance, a half-tipsy, dare-devil boldness, approaching as near the borders of a sinful state of mind as music can go. Now, every one will feel that it were better to have an ordinary choir sing one of Wesley's hymns of assured peace to the former air, than to have the finest choir in Christendom sing it to the latter. The very thought of singing such a hymn to such an air seems blasphemy. Yet we have heard Wesley's hymn, "A charge to keep I have," sung to tunes which were almost as inappropriate; and although sung by an excellent choir, accompanied by a magnificent organ, it was not church music. We have heard it sung to an air called in the *Carmina Sacra* "Ain," a joyous quickstep of Corelli, very similar to a theme in one of the marches in *Tancredi*; and we have heard it sung to an air from Haydn's *Creation*, the rejoicing strain, "A new-created world." In both these cases the music was good, and well executed, and yet the choir would have done better to have held their peace; for the music gave the lie to the hymn, and the hymn to the music. It was impossible to feel the solemn sense of religious responsibility which the hymn uttered, so long as such joyous strains of music filled the ear; and it was impossible to feel the joyous music, while the solemn charge of the hymn was still pressed on the attention. The singing was therefore a nullity, a self-destroying mixture of incongruous elements.

Let it not be supposed that the error consists in introducing such strains into the service of the sanctuary. Religious joy is the natural and highest state of a sanctified heart, and hymns of triumph and gladness are properly introduced into every liturgy. If these be sung at all, they should be sung to appropriate music. If the hymn, "Come, ye that love the Lord," be sung, it should be sung to such airs as that of Haydn just referred to. To sing it to that exquisite morceau from Beethoven,



called in the *Carmina Sacra* "Gorton," would be an error of the same kind, though in the opposite direction, as those which we have mentioned.

Neither let it be supposed that the error consists in introducing into church services music which has been associated with secular words. This is, it is true, frequently an aggravation of the evil, but it by no means constitutes the principal offence. Many of the congregation may be ignorant of the fact that such words may have been associated with it, but none can be totally insensible of the fact that the words of the hymn are not adapted to it. Not one in a thousand of those who hear the tunes called in the Handel and Haydn Collection "*Smyrna*" and "*Camden*," may know that they are selected from Mozart's operas; but every man susceptible to music will perceive that they have in them no religious element whatever, the first expressing conjugal love, and the second, adulation of a hero, earthly praise and congratulation. No Christian hymn can be imagined to which the latter is appropriate, and the use of the first with hymns of Christian affection would not be in perfectly good taste, even if the melody were not associated with the scenes of *Don Giovanni*. Charles Zeuner appears to have felt this, for although he allows *Smyrna* a place in the *Ancient Lyre*, he warns the chorister that it is not a sacred melody.

Sometimes an attempt is made to alter a secular air by changing the cadence to a religious form. We have recently heard tunes of this character from some new collection of sacred (!) music; popular Irish and Negro melodies being cut off in the last measure, and a chord of the subdominant introduced, as it were to sanctify them. The result is, that the tunes are spoiled for whistling on a week-day, without being rendered fit to sing on a Sunday. They neither express the wild mingling of pathos and humor of the Irish tunes, the dreamy wailing hidden under the outside gayety of the Negro songs, nor yet any properly religious emotions. They are senseless, mutilated fragments, ill pieced together.

A large proportion of the recent psalmody published in this country seems to us almost devoid of meaning. We have said that every melody expresses a sentiment,

or a state of the feelings. But many of those of which we are now speaking express that passionless, indifferent state in which an organist may sit down and extemporize music with his fingers, while he is talking on indifferent subjects to by-standers. They are simply successions of chords which do not violate any rules of musical grammar. They answer to the poetry of newspaper correspondents, — not to the bold, glowing, burning words of Watts, not to the earnest, devoted spirit of Doddridge's hymns, not to the fervor and unction of Charles Wesley. When we hear these beautiful songs of Zion sung to one of these bloodless solfeggios, we say with Hamlet, "I had as lief the town-crier had spoke my lines." The music does not directly contradict the hymn, but it refuses to say amen to it, and so far destroys its effect on the congregation.

We say upon the congregation. Amateurs in art are apt to suppose that the multitude are incapable of appreciating art; but this is a great mistake. The amateur and critic have powers of expression above the multitude; the amateur being able to practise the art to some extent, and the critic to comprehend its laws and analyze its spirit. But it does not follow that either of them have any more real appreciation of its spirit.

To confine ourselves to music, premising at the beginning that the same remarks may be applied with the necessary changes to the other arts, we affirm that the pianist who has most facility in fingering, or the violinist who has the nicest ear, and is capable of detecting the slightest defect of intonation, or the singer who can catch at one hearing the most difficult melody and render it perfectly, is not always the one who is most capable of judging of the expression of music. The appreciation of the sentiment of a melody comes from a susceptible temperament, and a heart ready to respond to the sentiment. A man totally ignorant of music may, therefore, be better fitted to pronounce upon the suitableness of given tunes to given hymns, than many of those who can sing music at sight. There is, therefore, a strong reason for having religious people in the choir, or at least for having a religious chorister. The chorister must have, in addition to a knowledge of music, some religious emotions, or else he will not know how to perform the

most important part of his office,—the selection of music appropriate to the hymns, and appropriate to the other services of the hour. And this is the most important part of his office, because the number of those who can detect falsity of intonation, irregularity of time, and neglect of dynamic effects is small, while all that have human hearts will feel, more or less sensitively, any incongruity between the music and the words of the hymn.

The views which we have thus expressed concerning the vital importance of selecting music for the sanctuary which shall in and of itself express sentiments fitting for the occasion, and for the words, either of the prayer or sermon which has immediately preceded, or of the hymn to which it is to be sung, seem to us self-evident. But if any man doubts that every piece of music expresses definitely some particular state of emotion, we will acknowledge that we have arrived at our faith through a long series of experiments, extending over a period of twelve years, and embracing many persons of every degree of culture. We have not what is commonly called a musical ear,—recognizing airs with difficulty, unable to intonate correctly, unable to detect false intonations in others, pronounced by phrenologists deficient in the organ of tune; and yet we have been passionate lovers of music from our earliest remembrance. The psychological puzzle which we presented to ourselves, in this respect, is not of uncommon occurrence, and we have sought experimentally to solve it by endeavoring to ascertain whether music had not two languages,—one to the ear, one to the heart; whether what is usually called a musical ear was not merely an ear for the articulation, enunciation, and pronunciation of music, and whether its meaning was not recognized by means of some broader faculty of the soul. It has been our practice to test various friends by playing to them airs, with which we knew they were unacquainted, and asking them to define the character of the melody. We have found that all persons of sensitive nature, whether possessed of a musical ear or not, agree in their opinion of the same tune, and agree in attributing to it the character which is ascribed to it by the best musical critics.

But of all those whose powers we have thus tested, none have given us such exact and marvellous analyses

of music as a friend whom we will, for convenience, designate by the initial K. He is a man of the highest culture, of quick and deep emotions, of good judgment, of noble character, but entirely destitute of musical ear. This destitution is however amply balanced by the possession of an exquisite musical taste, arising from the sensitiveness, warmth, and depth of his feelings. We have been in the habit of whistling, singing, and playing to him upon the flute and upon the piano, airs from oratorios and operas, and asking his opinion of their meaning. His memory of music is so poor, that we have frequently played the same air several times within an hour without his recollecting having heard it before. But his analysis of its expression would always agree with his previous analysis. Sometimes, seating him in a different room, we have silently placed music on the piano for a third person to play, and K., without having anything to judge from save the tones of the instrument, has told us the precise character of the words for which the music was written. Sometimes we have tried him again on the same music, after intervals of weeks, months, and even years, and have always found his criticism agree with that which he at first gave. Sometimes we have at the different trials given him the melody on different instruments, but his judgment of a particular tune has been the same, whether whistled, sung, or played on the flute or the piano. He would also give us nearly the same answer when the time of the music was taken too quick or too slow, as when taken right; the expression being modified and injured by being hurried or "*dragged*," but no new expression being introduced.

A few examples of the manner in which K. speaks of music will show how delicate are the shades of feeling which melody is capable of expressing; and will be interesting, because they are at least perfectly impartial criticisms, being made by one who knew nothing of the music of which he spoke, except what the tones themselves gave him.

We will select, as instances, a few passages from Handel, and simply write, after naming each passage, what K. said concerning it, before he knew that the music was Handel's, or what were the words set to it.

"I know that my Redeemer liveth." Joyous confidence; and at another time, joyful confidence.



"Awake the trumpet's lofty sound, The sacred joyful festival comes round, When Dagon, king of all the earth, is crowned." Joyful anticipation and triumph.

"Ye men of Gaza, hither bring The merry fife and pleasing string." Cheerful encouragement.

The reply of the Chorus to Samson's desponding prophecy of his own death, "When round about the starry throne Your heavenly guided soul shall climb." Hope rising on eagles' wings to the very heavens, and yet having some reference to a previous state of despair.

"And triumph over Death, and Chance, and Time." Triumph and almost exultation. On our asking what he meant by exultation, he replied, I mean an express mention of the things over which you triumph, as though you would tread them under foot.

"Total eclipse, no sun, no moon." Sad memories, solemn and grand.

The dead march from Samson, which is introduced to form the transition from the chorus, "Weep, Israel, weep a louder strain, Samson, your strength, your hero's slain," to the bass solo, "Glorious hero." The utterance of a soul too full of emotion to refrain from utterance, and yet with emotions so nicely balanced that it knows not whether to break forth into lamentation or eulogy. This judgment has been expressed at various times, and has been nearly the same whether the march was whistled, sung, or played.

The dead march in Saul. Grief on a grand scale. Fit for the funeral of a king. The most profound consciousness of weakness, sustained by the loftiest and serenest trust in God.

We might extend this list further, not only from Handel, but from Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, and from many living composers. No music is, according to these unbiased criticisms of K., more perfectly adapted to the words, than the church tunes of Charles Zeuner in the American Harp are adapted to their accompanying hymns. But we have given examples enough, we think, to sustain our main position, that music is the language of emotions, and that it is a definite language. From this it follows by irresistible necessity, since the cause must be of more importance than the effects, that the discussions of church music, which have for several

months filled our religious newspapers, have scarcely touched the most important point of all. Of what consequence is it whether our church music is Italian, German, or American, if it is not religious? Of what consequence whether it is selected from operas or oratorios, or symphonies, or written for psalm tunes, if, after all, it is not adapted to be sung in the house of worship? Of what consequence whether it is performed by the congregation or by a choir, or by a quartette, if it expresses emotions unfit to be felt in the place of prayer?

Nay, we will even go so far as to ask, Of what consequence is it whether the music is well or ill performed, in comparison with the question whether it is well or ill adapted to the service of which it professes to make a part? We have known Yankee Doodle to be played as a voluntary in church, by an excellent organist and upon an excellent organ; and surely the perfection of the execution did nothing to detract from the pain of religious souls that heard it. No jargon of harsh sounds could have been more discordant with the occasion.

It has been assumed, by some of the few who have noticed the adaptation of music to words, that we cannot have music adapted to the hymn, unless we have the hymn expressly set to music, as in the old Lock Hospital collection, from which some of the gems of later collections have been taken. But this assumption proceeds from the error of supposing that it is essential to have the notes adapted to the words, as well as the tune adapted to the hymn. If this were so, we could seldom have different verses of a song or hymn sung to the same tune. But the attempt to make the music correspond to the words, as well as the stanza, arises from a false idea of the source of expression in music. The expression lies in the whole phrases of the melody, not in the particular notes. In like manner, the meaning of a stanza may be quite opposite to that of particular words in it, and a whole stanza and whole melody may be exquisitely adapted to each other, although particular words and notes may be badly joined. Thus, an exquisite scrap from Beethoven, called, in several collections, Germany, is beautifully adapted to a stanza beginning with the words, "Softly the shades of evening fall," although the words "silence reigns" chance to fall upon that part of the

melody which, by natural musical emphasis, will be sung the loudest.

We hold, therefore, that the true principles of music do not call upon us to give up our New England psalmody, our practice of singing successive verses to the same tune. The remedy for the defects of our church music does not lie in any outward, mechanical rule, — in giving up organs and choirs, in abandoning man-made hymns, in avoiding airs from operas, or in introducing airs from operas. Nor does it lie, as some would have us believe, in the more general cultivation of a musical ear. The cultivation of the ear alone were as foolish in music, as the cultivation of the intellect alone in general education. We need a cultivation of a correct musical taste, as well as of a correct musical ear. We need to feel that the music of the sanctuary is a matter of interest to all the congregation, and that the first duty of all is to have that music an expression of religious sentiment.

The duty devolves, in the first place, upon the organist and chorister, but it belongs also to all the people. An organist who played a waltz as a voluntary after prayer, told a friend of ours that he was not to blame, that he found that secular music was more popular than sacred music; that he had frequently been reproached with the dull character of his music, when he played really religious voluntaries, and complimented when he introduced lighter themes; and that he thought that the musical people of the congregation were as much to blame as himself for this desecration of the house of worship.

In other words, those who had no religious feelings in their hearts, light and worldly-minded people, liked worldly music, and looked upon religious music as they did upon other religious matters, as being dull and tiresome. In the Church of England it is by express statute made the duty of the minister to prevent the performance of light and unseemly music in the sanctuary. In our Congregational churches the power is, by the very nature of Congregationalism, vested in the congregation, and every member of that congregation must bear his proportion of the guilt, if that power is not exercised wisely and in the fear of God.

T. H.

## ART. V.—THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF SACRIFICE.\*

It is an encouraging omen in regard to the progress of religious truth, that such Sermons as are contained in the volume whose title is given below should have been preached by a clergyman in good standing, in a celebrated pulpit of the Church of England, and should be published for readers of that Church. The views of sacrifice, especially of the sacrifice of Christ, are, in their essential features, such as have been maintained by Unitarian writers, and have been slowly forcing their way among Christians of other denominations. But the public avowal and defence of them from the pulpit and the press, by clergymen holding a high standing in the larger denominations of Christians, is an event of rare occurrence.

The volume under consideration contains nineteen sermons, with the following titles: "The Sacrifices of Cain and Abel"; "Noah's Sacrifice"; "The Sacrifice of Abraham"; "Sacrifice of the Passover"; "The Legal Sacrifices"; "David's Sacrifice"; "The Lamb before the Foundation of the World"; "Christ's Sacrifice and Redemption"; "Christ's Sacrifice and Deliverance from the Curse of the Law"; "The Sacrifice of Christ a Propitiation"; "The Sacrifice of Christ the Purification of the Conscience"; "Christ made Sin for us"; "Christ's Sacrifice the Peace-offering for Mankind"; "Christ's Sacrifice a Power to form us after His Likeness"; "Christ's Death a Victory over the Devil"; "Christ the Advocate"; "Christ the High-Priest"; "The Adoration of the Lamb"; "The Word of God conquering by Sacrifice."

These Sermons of Mr. Maurice are marked by the very peculiar style of thought and illustration which prevailed in his Theological Essays, reviewed in our number for March, 1854. But they are well adapted to effect the end which he has in view, the removal of a great and noxious error from the theology of the Church. The somewhat mystical vein of thought which runs through them will probably make them more effective with those for whom they were designed, than the clearer state-

---

\* *The Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from the Scriptures. A Series of Sermons, by* FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, M. A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn. Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1854.



ments of Unitarian writers, even if the latter could gain access to the same readers.

The occasion of these Sermons was the necessity, in which the writer found himself placed, of vindicating certain sentiments concerning the doctrine of atonement advanced by him in the Theological Essays above referred to. In one of those Essays Mr. Maurice had exposed the deformity of a theory which has been fastened on the Christian doctrine of atonement, — the theory that the sacrifice of Christ derived its chief value from being the actual punishment which the wicked had incurred, or a punishment equivalent to it. This theory of the efficacy of sacrifices in general, and of the sacrifice of Christ in particular, he endeavors to show, in the volume of Sermons now under consideration, to be false and heathenish : —

“ I find,” says he, “ from the history of the world, expounded by the Bible, that there has been always a tendency in the corrupt heart of man to make sacrifice itself the minister of man’s self-will, self-indulgence, self-glorification. Instead of giving himself to God, man seeks to make his God, or his Gods, give up to him ; he offers sacrifices that he may persuade the power which he thinks he has wronged to exempt him from the punishment of his wrong. This is man’s theology ; this is what has produced all the hateful superstitions under which the world groans.” — *Dedicatory Letter*, p. xlvii.

Again : —

“ I must ask God himself to tell me how I may be delivered from it,” i. e. the heathenish tendency to regard the sacrifice of Christ as a punishment substituted for the punishment of the wicked, — “ how I may receive the true sacrifice which taketh away the sins of the world, and so be prevented from accepting notions of sacrifice which increase and deepen the sin of the world ; which suggest thoughts of God that destroy his righteousness, and make him after the image of my unrighteousness ; which lead men to practices that are hateful to him and destructive to themselves,” — *Ibid.*, p. xlviii.

In the accomplishment of his design Mr. Maurice, as might be expected in sermons addressed to a popular audience, proceeds in the way of general considerations drawn from various instances of sacrifice in the Old Testament and from the language of the prophets, and from the general sense and spirit of the New Testament,

rather than in the way of exact criticism and scientific interpretation. His main proposition is, that every true sacrifice is made by God himself.

"I have compared," he says, "the sacrifice which manifests the mind of God, — which proceeds from God, which accomplishes the purposes of God in the redemption and reconciliation of his creatures, which enables those creatures to become like their Father in heaven by offering up themselves, — and the sacrifices which men have dreamed of in one country or another, as means of changing the purposes of God, of converting him to their mind, of procuring deliverance from the punishment of evil, while the evil still exists." — *Ibid.*, p. xlviii.

The remark, that "God makes the sacrifice," Mr. Maurice applies to the Old as well as the New Dispensation, to David and to Christ alike. Though we are not sure that we get his whole meaning, it appears to be not only that the eternal and unpurchased love of God appointed the sacrifice, that "He spared not his own son," and "set him forth as a propitiatory sacrifice," but that he makes it by disposing the human heart to the exercise of that spirit of self-denial and obedience which constitutes the only true sacrifice. Thus, in the Sermon on the Sacrifice of David, he says:—

"To sink humbly on the knees, to say, *Against thee I have sinned; I have done this evil in thy sight*, — how is this possible? What brings a man to this? And what kind of offering is this? David knew at last what it was. It was *the sacrifice of God*. He had not brought himself into that posture; God had brought him into it. He had corrected and broken him. He had prepared the sacrifice." — p. 95.

Again, in the Sermon, "Christ's Sacrifice a Redemption," he says:—

"He was the servant of all. Here was the sacrifice with which God was well pleased; here was the costly oblation; here was the mighty ransom, by which the one was able to deliver the many. The lowliest of all was the one who most showed forth the glory of God's love; the lowliest of all was the one who could alone exercise God's power on behalf of his creatures. That power was a redeeming power; that power came forth when the Son gave up his spirit to his Father; that power becomes effectual for us when it redeems us from our pride, when it breaks that chain which has kept us in slavery to the spirit of disobedience, which has hindered us from serving

the living God. We know the meaning of the ransom, we understand the greatness of the sacrifice, when we give up the craving to be chief of all, and ask for the spirit of Christ to make us the servants of all." — p. 130.

On the whole, while we can cordially recommend the work of Mr. Maurice as well adapted to convey, in the main, correct ideas of the Christian atonement, we cannot say that he has proceeded in a way which will satisfy scholars, or those who wish to have the Scriptures expounded according to the established laws of interpretation. We take leave of him with sentiments of respect for his deep earnestness in the cause of truth and human improvement, and for the good which he has done and is doing. As we do not recollect, in the pages of the *Examiner*, any full discussion of the subject of the Jewish sacrifices, and their bearing and influence on Christian doctrines, and as we regard it as one of great importance, we propose to enter upon it somewhat in detail, especially giving our attention to the import and design of the sacrifices for sin, and the meaning of language borrowed from them by the Apostles of Christ.

The Old Testament has nowhere defined the precise import of the Jewish sacrifices. It has informed us of their design, but not of their significance or import. They appear in the Jewish worship, as if it were taken for granted that their import and significance were too well known to need explanation. We are obliged, therefore, to gather their import from the circumstances of the case as presented in the Old Testament, and, in some measure, from those views which have prevailed respecting sacrifices in heathen nations. It is to be remembered that the age of sacrifices was not the age of definition. Sacrifices, therefore, may have expressed feelings and ideas not strictly and clearly defined even by those who offered them.

Perhaps we may find that different ideas have been connected with sacrifices in different nations and ages. But the most prevalent notion attached to them, so far as the motives and feelings of those who offered them is concerned, seems to have been that they were gifts or presents to the Deity, offered with a view to express thanks for past favors, or prayer for future blessings, or for forgiveness of sin in particular; and to make up for

the imperfect expression of human feeling in words by acts more or less indicative of self-denial and self-consecration. It is well known how universal has been the practice of endeavoring to gain the favor, or to appease the anger, of men by gifts. Thus, Prov. xxi. 14, "A gift in secret pacifieth anger, and a reward in the bosom, strong wrath." So Sirach vii. 9. Even at the present day the custom prevails in Eastern countries to an extent of which we in the Western world have scarcely a conception. So, in the general history of religion, nothing is more remarkable than the slowness with which the human mind has admitted the idea of a free pardon on the part of the Deity; of forgiveness of sin for his own mercy's sake. Notwithstanding the emphatic approbation by our Saviour of the sentiment, that to love God with all the heart is more than whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices, it has made its way slowly in the Christian Church. Faith in God, the surrender of the whole mind, heart, and will to him as a living sacrifice, has not been considered as sufficiently acceptable to him, unless some outward gift be made in order to procure forgiveness for past sins. Thus in the Church of Rome the sacrifice of the host is continually repeated; and in the Protestant Church the same tendency is manifested in the theories which have prevailed respecting the influence of the death of our Saviour. Men have been slow to believe that God can be so rich in mercy as not to impute past offences, or the remnants of sin in the most devoted Christians, to those who believe, and whose hearts and lives are changed, simply for his own eternal mercy's sake,—simply because he is God, and has revealed himself as God. Man must forgive his brother seventy times seven. Christ may forgive his timid and selfish, and inconstant disciples. But the Father of Christ and of all mankind, the Fountain of all the love and mercy which was in Christ and is in the hearts of all men, is supposed to demand something besides a believing, confiding, regenerate soul. If, then, such a sentiment prevail in the present enlightened state of the world, we see how much stronger it must have been in a low state of mental and religious culture. We see how sacrifices may have originated in the desire to give to the Deity something to make up for the imperfect ex-



pression of the feelings in words, and for the imperfect surrender of the soul to him. How natural was it for men in a low state of mental culture to suppose the favor of God to be gained, or his anger to be averted and his forgiveness obtained, by means similar to those which have been found effectual in regard to men, — that they should accompany their petitions for favors or for pardon, and their thanks for benefits received, with gifts of what they held most dear to themselves! In some stages of society, food, whether of fruits or animals, has been the most valuable possession of men. Hence the most prevalent sacrifices have been of those things which were used as food or the accompaniments of a feast, such as fruits, animals, incense, or libations. This was the case with all the sacrifices allowed by the Hebrew law. So in Homer, *Iliad*, IX. 497, &c. :—

“The Gods,  
Although more honorable, and in power  
And virtue thy superiors, are themselves  
Yet placable; and if a mortal man  
Offend them by transgression of their laws,  
Libation, incense, sacrifice, and prayer,  
In meekness offered, turn their wrath away.”

Evidently these sacrifices were regarded in the light of gifts to the Deity. That even sin-offerings were regarded in the same light by the Philistines is evident from a passage in 1 Sam. vi. 3, 4 :—

“And they said, If ye send away the ark of the God of Israel, send it not away empty, but in any case return a trespass-offering. . . . Then said they, What shall be the trespass-offering which we shall return to him? They answered, Five golden emerods, and five golden mice, according to the number of the lords of the Philistines; for one plague was on you all.”

Certainly the gold can be regarded only as a gift; and yet it was a trespass-offering.

So in Ovid, *Ars Amat.*, III. 653 :—

“Munera, crede mihi, capiunt hominesque deosque;  
Placatur donis Jupiter ipse datis.”

So Homer, near the beginning of the first book of the *Iliad* :—

“ — that we may learn  
What crime of ours Apollo thus resents,  
What broken vow, what hecatomb unpaid  
He charges on us, and if soothed with steam  
Of lambs or goats unblemished, he may yet  
Be won to spare us, and avert the plague.”

Herodotus relates (Clio, c. 50) that Cræsus, having offended the god at Delphi, endeavored to propitiate him not only by offering animals, but that “having made a great pyre of couches covered with gold and silver, golden goblets, purple garments, and tunics, he burnt them.” Garments in great quantities were, as is well known, regarded as treasures in the East. Hence our Saviour says, “Lay not up treasures, which the moth may corrupt.” Whatever was regarded as of great value to the possessor used to be offered as a sacrifice. Thus in different nations warriors have presented to the gods their weapons and shields, conquerors a part of their booty, fishermen their nets, shepherds their flutes, artists their instruments or their works, sick persons pictures on which their diseases were painted, or gold and silver images of the diseased part of the body. Young men and maidens have given their hair; and the latter their girdles, and even their chastity. Fathers have even sacrificed their children, as in the case of the Moabites. So, also, according to Virgil, *Æn.* II. 117, —

“Sanguine placastis ventos, et virgine cæsâ,  
Quum primum Iliacas, Danai, venistis ad oras;  
Sanguine quærendi reditus, animâque litandum  
Argolicâ.”

The case of Iphigenia among the Greeks has also a parallel in Jephthah's daughter.

Passages might be multiplied from the classics, which show that the prevalent idea connected with sacrifices was, that they were gifts of whatever was regarded as most precious, and to part with which was the greatest exercise of self-denial. That this was also the view of the Hebrews is evident from the circumstance, that the materials of which their offerings were composed, whether of fruits, flour, wine, oil, or animals, must always be of the best kind. This also appears from the manner in which they are spoken of by the Psalmists and prophets. Thus, Ps. l. 9-13: —

“ I will take no bullock from thy house,  
Nor he-goat from thy folds ;  
For all the beasts of the forest are mine,  
And the cattle on a thousand hills.

Do I eat the flesh of bulls,  
Or drink the blood of goats ? ”

So in Ps. li. 16, 17 : —

“ For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it ;  
Thou delightest not in burnt-offerings ;  
The sacrifice which God loveth is a broken spirit ;  
A broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.”

So in Malachi i. 7, 8 : —

“ Ye bring polluted food to mine altar,  
And ye say, Wherein do we pollute thee ?  
In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible.  
For when ye bring the blind for sacrifice,  
[Ye say,] It is not evil,  
And when ye offer the lame and the sick,  
[Ye say,] It is not evil.  
Offer it, then, to thy governor ;  
Will he be pleased with thee,  
Or have regard to thee ?  
Saith the Lord of hosts.”

One more passage is the very striking one in the prophet Micah (vi. 6-8) : —

“ Wherewith shall I come before the Lord,  
And bow myself before the most high God ?  
Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings,  
With calves of a year old ?  
Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams,  
Or with ten thousands of rivers of oil ?  
Shall I give my first-born for my sin,  
The fruit of my body for my transgression ?  
He hath showed thee, O man, what is good ;  
What doth the Lord require of thee,  
But to do justly, and to love mercy,  
And to walk humbly before thy God ? ”

All these passages in their manifest import show that the sacrifices of animals, as well as of things without life, were regarded in the light of gifts to the Deity ; gifts of what was held most dear ; gifts of what cost the

greatest self-denial; gifts by which men strove to express their feelings in a stronger way than by words, and to make up for their imperfect devotion of themselves to God in duty and obedience.

It is possible that among some nations the idea may have prevailed that the Deity was fond of blood, in itself considered. What account can we give of the horrible sacrifices of the Aztecs, as described by Mr. Prescott in his *Conquest of Mexico*, except that they were regarded as pleasing to their god of war because they were bloody, and glutted the vengeance with which, thinking their Deity to be altogether such an one as themselves, they had clothed him? Mr. Wilson, in his recent work, "*Lands of the Bible Revisited*," giving an account of the Samaritans, says:—

"We asked them why God preferred the sacrifice of an animal to an offering of fruit. They gave an answer more worthy of those who walk in the darkness of absolute heathenism, than of those who profess to be guided by the light of Divine Revelation: 'God likes blood, because in blood there is life.'"

In regard to the peculiar import of the blood in the Jewish sacrifices of animals, since it was used in sacrifices of adoration and thanksgiving, as well as in sacrifices for sin, it seems to denote the divesting of the offerer of his property in it, and the giving it up to God; giving the very essence of it, the life of it, the most sacred part of it, to God. In order to complete this idea, the whole of some sacrifices, and parts of others, used to be burned. Thus the burning of the garments by Cræsus, before alluded to, was in order to divest himself of his property in them, and make them the property of the god to whom they were presented.

We have thus far considered sacrifices in reference to the feelings, motives, and ideas of those who offered them. They also appear in the Old Testament as sanctioned by the Deity. What are we to think of the fact, that a mode of worship so abhorrent to the feelings of all enlightened nations at the present day, should appear in the Bible, we will not say as appointed, but as sanctioned, by the Deity? The answer appears to be, that they were of human origin, and were sanctioned by the Deity, in condescension to human weakness and the



circumstances of the times, as helps of worship and prayer, and as a means of pacifying the consciences of the penitent and reconciling their souls to God. It is probable that the Israelites, in their long residence in Egypt, had been accustomed to many symbols and forms in use among the Egyptians, which were the appropriate language of religious worship. To the men of that age they seemed proper and expressive. It would have been very unwise in Moses to have ordained the disuse at once of all the symbols and forms by which the religious sentiments and feelings of the Hebrews had been usually expressed. It would probably have been as unwise as it would be at the present day for a religious reformer to ordain that his followers should express their religious feelings in other modes than that of words. This is the account given of the matter by the ancient Christian Fathers, by distinguished Jewish writers, and by eminent Biblical students in modern times. Chrysostom, in his sixth homily on St. Matthew, says: "All these things," i. e. the sacrifices, purifications, new moons, etc., "had their origin in the rudeness of the Gentiles. For God, aiming at the salvation of those who were gone astray, suffered himself to be worshipped by these things with which the Gentiles worshipped demons, changing them somewhat for the better; that by degrees he might wean them from the custom, and bring them to a higher wisdom." Similar quotations might be made from Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, Theodoret, St. Cyril, and Epiphanius, from Maimonides and Abarbanel, and from Petavius, Grotius, and Spencer.\*

Of all the forms of Jewish worship, that which has exerted the greatest influence on Christian theology is the sacrifice for sin. A false view of it still continues to uphold one of the most irrational doctrines which ever prevailed in the Church. We shall, therefore, be engaged in no question of mere curiosity or antiquity, when we devote a few pages to the illustration of its design and meaning.

The design of the sin-offering is expressed in the words, *to make an atonement* for the offender, or for the soul of the offender. In every case, however, where the

---

\* See Spencer, *De Legibus*, Lib. III. Diss. 2, Cap. 1, § 1, 2, where quotations from the writers mentioned may be found.

term *atonement* occurs in connection with the sin-offering, it denotes *reconciliation*, *at-one-ment*. It was, probably, so understood by the translators of the Common Version; 1. because such was the common meaning of the term at the time, as may be learned from Shakespeare and other writers; and 2. because they translate the same Hebrew term sometimes *atonement* and sometimes *reconciliation*. Thus, in Exod. xxxii. 30: "And it came to pass on the morrow that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin; and now will I go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin." On this verse we remark, first, that Moses is represented as expecting to make atonement for the people by prayer. This alone shows that the term denotes simply *reconciliation*. Secondly, the same Hebrew word, in the same conjugation, is rendered "*to make reconciliation upon it*" in Lev. viii. 15. So in Lev. vi. 30: "And no sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation, *to reconcile withal* in the holy place, shall be eaten. It shall be burnt in the fire." So also in Ezek. xlv. 15, 17; Dan. ix. 24.

But the most important consideration is that the Hebrew term כָּפַר, sometimes rendered *to make atonement*, undoubtedly means *to make reconciliation*, or, more strictly, *to cause forgiveness*. In Kal, כָּפַר, it means *to cover*, *to smear over*, for instance, the ark with pitch, Gen. vi. 14. Hence, *to obliterate* or *annul* a compact, Is. xxviii. 18. In the Piel conjugation, the first meaning, being derived from the sense *to cover*, or *obliterate*, is *to forgive*. Thus, Ps. lxxviii. 38: "He being full of compassion, *forgave* their iniquity," יָכַפֵּר. Jer. xviii. 23: "*Forgive* not their iniquity." Ezek. xvi. 63: "When *I forgive* thee for all thou hast done." Here the word is the same, and in the same conjugation, though the Common Version renders it, "when *I am pacified* toward thee," etc. The first meaning, then, of the Piel conjugation being *to forgive*, the second meaning is *to cause forgiveness*, according to the well-known use of that conjugation. *To cause forgiveness*, *to make reconciliation*, *to make atonement*, have the same meaning. A consideration of the Hebrew verb, as well as the other facts which have been mentioned, shows that the phrase "*to make atonement*," as understood by the translators of

the Common Version, is equivalent to the phrases "to procure forgiveness," "to effect reconciliation." It never means "to make satisfaction," "to expiate by punishment," or anything of the kind, but simply *to procure forgiveness, to effect reconciliation or atonement*. We do not know that the term *expiate* or *expiatory* is ever used in the Scriptures. This term is used by some theological writers to express the meaning of the Hebrew term on which we have commented. If then we meet the term *expiate* or *expiatory* applied to the Hebrew sacrifices, we must remember that *to expiate* means simply *to procure forgiveness*, and that an *expiatory* sacrifice means a sacrifice *which procures forgiveness or effects reconciliation*, without reference to the material of the sacrifice, or the manner in which it was made. Moses, in Exod. xxxii. 30, is represented as making atonement by prayer. The Israelites "made atonement for their souls" by the payment of a half-shekel.

The design, then, of the sacrifices for sin was simply *to procure forgiveness, to effect reconciliation* with God, and thus to pacify the consciences of the believing and the penitent. And the significance of the material offered was, that it was a gift of what was regarded as valuable; a token to complete and indicate the entire surrender of the soul to God. Prayer and confession of sin, accompanied by true faith and repentance, would have been enough in themselves; but sacrifices for sin were permitted and sanctioned in condescension to human weakness, and to the education, the religious associations, and other circumstances of the Israelites in the time of Moses. As a means of obtaining the favor of the Deity, they strike us in this period of the world as irrational, unsuited to the nature of man and of the Deity. Hence, long before the time of Christ, they had lost their power over all thinking men, and were rapidly passing away before the progress of intellectual and moral culture. One of the later Hebrew prophets expressed this conviction in a very strong way, when he said (Isaiah lxvi. 2, 3): —

"For all these things hath my hand made;  
By it do all these things exist, saith Jehovah.  
But to this man will I look,  
Even to him who is humble and of a contrite spirit,

And who trembleth at my word.  
He that slayeth an ox killeth a man ;  
He that sacrificeth a lamb beheadeth a dog ;  
He that maketh an oblation offereth swine's blood ;  
He that burneth incense blesseth an idol."

These expressions of the Evangelical prophet were not probably intended to forbid sacrifices, but they do indicate a deep sense of their inappropriateness to the worship of God, and their want of intrinsic value.

There is another view of the significance of the Hebrew sacrifices for sin, which has obtained the support of so many modern theologians, that it requires a careful examination. This view regards the sacrifices for sin as *vicarious punishments*. It regards the animals sacrificed as, in some sense, taking the sins of the offerer, and suffering the punishment which the offerer deserved, or at least as symbolizing in their sufferings that punishment. This is the view maintained by Jahn in his *Archæology*, by Magee in his work on the Atonement, and by some other writers less under the influence of dogmatic theology.

The theory that sacrifices for sin in the Jewish worship imported vicarious punishments appears at first view plausible, from the circumstance that death has been generally regarded by human governments as the highest punishment for crimes. Indeed, it would be remarkable in the history of superstitious sacrifices if, among some nations and at some periods of the world, the sacrificed animals had not been regarded as taking the sins and suffering the punishments of the offender who offered them. But that such a meaning was attached to their sacrifices by the Jews, we can find, in the Old Testament or elsewhere, no reason to believe.

The most strenuous advocates of the vicarious punishment of the sins of men in the person of Christ would reject the view, that the sin and punishment of a man were actually transferred to the animal which was sacrificed. For, if the animal sacrificed actually took the sins and suffered the punishment of the offender, what need could there be of such a sacrifice as that of Christ? If guilt could be transferred to a brute, and the punishment of guilt be borne by the patient ox, or the innocent lamb, or the loving dove, what more was necessary in the way of punishment?



All consistent orthodox theologians would deny that the Deity ever sanctioned such a view of the efficacy of sacrifices. They can only maintain that guilt was symbolically transferred to the animals sacrificed, and that the sacrifice of the animal was *symbolical* of the punishment which he deserved. This last view is all, then, which it is necessary for us to examine.

I. Our first objection to this theory of the significance of sacrifices for sin is, that it fails to give that importance to them which was given them in nations where they have prevailed. It makes them amount simply to a figurative, emblematic acknowledgment of sin and desert of punishment on the part of those who offered them; an acknowledgment by symbolical action, as well as by words. But can it be that all the sacrifices were regarded as mere symbols? Were all the hecatombs of the heathen, all the garments which were burned, all the children that were sacrificed, all the human beings that were immolated, *mere* symbolical acknowledgments of guilt, and emblematic representations of punishment? Is not the view which we have given above, that the sacrifices were regarded as gifts to the Deity, by which they hoped to make reconciliation and avert punishment, far more probable? The same questions may be asked respecting the sacrifices of the Jews. We are told that Solomon offered at the dedication of the temple twenty thousand oxen, and one hundred and twenty thousand sheep. When sacrifices were offered in such number and variety, were they not regarded as *gifts* rather than symbolical representations?

II. A strong argument against regarding the sin and trespass offerings of the Jews as symbolical punishments, is the nature of the sins for which they were made. They were made for sins for which no express punishment was provided in the laws of Moses; chiefly unintentional sins, or sins of ignorance, inadvertence, and precipitancy, or mere violations of ritual laws. We do not, however, make much account of the distinction between moral and ritual laws, so far as the Jews are concerned. But in cases where the impurity for which atonement was to be made was the direct consequence of a law of nature, for instance, the legal impurity of a woman after child-birth, the distinction seems to us to

be important. Allowing that in some cases the sin-offerings were made under a sense of actual guilt, yet, being made in other cases for what was wholly unintentional, or for what was in consequence of a law of nature, it is highly improbable that the sacrifice of the animal was intended to be a symbol of the punishment which the offerer deserved. How could a Jewish woman feel that she deserved the extreme punishment of death, on account of what was the inevitable consequence of bringing a human being into the world?

III. The principal argument, and at first view a plausible one, and one which has had the greatest influence on those who have not made the Jewish sacrifices the subject of study, in favor of the opinion that the sacrifices for sin were symbolical of the punishment which the offerer deserved, is that the animals were slain, and that premature death is universally considered a great evil, and is employed by human governments as the highest penalty of crime. But this argument is susceptible of complete refutation. For, in the first place, it does not account for the circumstance that all the animals used by the Jews for sacrifice were such as were in ordinary use for food, and those the best of their kind. The swine was as innocent an animal as the ox. It has no horns to push with; and if the sacrifice for sin were intended to be a symbol of the punishment which the offerer deserved, it is not easy to see why the swine would not have answered the purpose as well as the ox.

In the second place, the sacrifice of animals as sin-offerings does not appear to have been accompanied by such circumstances as indicated punishment. There was no torture in the mode of putting them to death, and nothing indicating execration or contempt. On the contrary, the blood of the animal, the life of it, was offered in the most solemn manner to God through the priest, and was said to be of a sweet savor to him.

In the third place, a complete answer to the argument that sacrifices for sin were symbols of punishment because they were bloody, is, that bloody sacrifices were offered on other occasions, to which acknowledgment of sin and desert of punishment would be entirely foreign. Sacrifices of blood were used for thank-offerings as much as for sin-offerings. They were also used in ado-

ration and general prayer for blessings. They were helps to the expression of gratitude, and were constantly used for this purpose by heathen nations, as well as by the Jews. We must therefore seek an explanation of the fact that the life or blood of the animal was so acceptable to God, which will apply to eucharistic sacrifices as well as to sacrifices for sin. The true explanation is, that taking the life of the animal divested the offerer of his property in it, and made it the property of God; and that the blood or life was considered the most precious thing which could be offered to God.

In the fourth place, a very strong argument against the supposition that the animal sacrificed was a symbol of the punishment which the offerer deserved, is to be found in the circumstance that a poor man might bring as a sin-offering a portion of fine flour instead of a bullock, a kid, or a pair of turtle-doves. Now, a poor man needed to feel his guilt and desert of punishment as much as a rich one; and his being allowed to bring fine flour for a sin-offering shows that it was not intended to symbolize the punishment which he deserved for his sins. So, in some cases, the Jews made atonement by the payment of money, the Philistines by golden emeralds, and Cræsus by the burning of rich garments.

IV. Another argument which has been urged in favor of the idea that the Jewish sacrifices for sin were symbols of the punishment which the offerer deserved, is the ceremony of the imposition of hands upon the head of the animal sacrificed. This imposition of hands has been considered as a symbolical translation of the sins of the offender to the head of the animal preparatory to his suffering a symbolical punishment for them. But that this argument has no force is obvious from several considerations. 1. The imposition of hands was used in eucharistic sacrifices as well as in sacrifices for sin. Transferred guilt or substituted punishment could not have been thought of in the case of eucharistic sacrifices, when thanksgiving for deliverances and blessings received alone occupied the mind. 2. The ceremony of the imposition of hands has an obvious import, established by custom, in relation to various objects, as well as to sacrifices; objects in respect to which the idea of transference or substitution is inappropriate. It denotes the

setting apart of any person or thing to the purpose for which it was designed. It was used in commending a person to God in prayer, and in setting apart a person for any office. So, in the Christian Church, it has been used in the ordinance of confirmation, and in ordination to the ministry. According to these well-known usages, the imposition of hands on the head of the animal merely denoted the giving it up, in form, to God, or its consecration to the uses intended by the sacrifice, whatever those uses might be. So obvious is this, that even De Wette\* admits that the argument for transferred guilt and substituted punishment, drawn from the imposition of hands on the head of the animal sacrificed, has no force. Jahn,† who makes use of this argument, is obliged, in order to preserve his consistency, to maintain that, when the Apostles laid their hands on the heads of persons to be ordained for the service of the Church, it was to substitute them in their own place. According to this view, Paul did not ordain helpers and associates with him in the ministry, but rather substituted certain persons in his place, that he might retire on his laurels. Such are the absurdities to which men are often driven by a false theory. And yet, weak as this argument from the imposition of hands is, it seems to be the only argument on which a writer in the April number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for 1852 relies for the support of his view, that substituted punishment was denoted by the sin-offering.

V. Another argument in favor of the opinion that sacrifices for sin were regarded as vicarious punishments, or as symbols of the punishment which the offerer deserved, has been drawn from the supposition, that the animals used for sin-offerings were after death regarded as unclean, as if polluted with the transferred guilt of him that offered them. The answer to this argument is, that the supposition on which it proceeds is unfounded. It cannot be shown that the sin-offerings were regarded as unclean after the sacrifice. Certainly such a thing is nowhere stated. And the only reason for supposing it is, that, after the fat, kidneys, blood, and other parts of

---

\* *Opuscula Crit.*, p. 264.† *Archæology*, § 378.



the animal, had been burned or used on the altar, the rest of the bullock — i. e. his skin, flesh, blood, etc. — was to be carried forth to a clean place and there burned.\* But this fact by no means supports the conclusion which has been drawn from it. On the contrary, if any part of the animal were regarded as polluted by transferred guilt, it would be that part which made the atonement, viz. the blood and what was burned on the altar. But this is not pretended. De Wette used this argument in an early work of his, but in a subsequent one, his *Archæologie*, p. 267, he pronounces it untenable, and gives it up, after it had been largely employed, by those who relied on his authority, in favor of imputed sin, and punishment by substitute, as denoted by the sin-offering. The writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, above referred to, is also obliged to admit (p. 41) that “a weaker, more distorted argument in support of the theory of vicarious penal death in the offering could not be given.”

VI. There is one case, however, in which an animal was represented as bearing, in some sense, the sins of the people, which requires distinct consideration. We refer to what in the Common Version, Lev. xvi. 8, etc. is called “the scape-goat,” which was sent into the wilderness on the great day of annual atonement. On entering upon an explanation of this matter, it must be premised that the term *scape-goat* is probably an incorrect rendering of the Hebrew *אֲזָזֵל*, *Azazel*. *Azazel* is to be regarded as the name, not of an animal, but of an evil demon, whose abode was in the wilderness. Such was the opinion of Spencer, Witsius, Gesenius, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Hengstenberg, and some of the ancient Fathers. The passage will then read as follows : —

“And Aaron shall cast lots for the two goats, one lot for Jehovah, and the other lot for Azazel. And Aaron shall bring the goat upon which the lot for Jehovah fell, and offer him for a sin-offering. But the goat on which the lot for Azazel fell shall be presented alive before Jehovah to make an atonement with it, to let him go to Azazel into the wilderness.”

And in verse 21 : —

“Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel,

---

\* Leviticus, chap. ix.

and all their transgression in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness. And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness."

Now it is to be observed that the live goat which was sent into the wilderness, symbolically laden with the sins of the people, was not sacrificed at all; of course he could not represent *the punishment* of sin. The design of sending the live goat into the wilderness seems to have been to represent symbolically the complete removal of the sins of the people, which had obtained forgiveness through the sacrifice of the other goat, and thus more completely to pacify the consciences of the people.\* Their sins were to be carried to a land not inhabited, the chosen abode of demons, to Azazel in the wilderness. But nothing of this kind was said of the sin-offering. That was given to Jehovah in sacrifice. A similar case occurs, in Lev. xiv. 4, in the purification of a leper, where two birds were used. One of them was offered in sacrifice, and the other let loose and caused to fly away, thus symbolically denoting the removal of the disease. So the goat sent into the wilderness denotes, not the punishment of sin, but the removal of it.

VII. The case of the covenant sacrifices has been adduced as favoring by analogy the idea of vicarious suffering in the sin-offering. In the covenant sacrifices those who made the covenant walked between the parts of an animal cut in two, thus imprecating upon themselves a calamity as great as that inflicted on the animal, if they should break their covenant. But who does not see that the covenant sacrifice is used only as a symbolic help to give force to an imprecation? There is nothing of a vicarious nature in it.

VIII. Another case, which has been supposed by some writers to have a bearing upon the subject under discussion, is that of the heifer, mentioned in Deut. xxi. 1-9. When a murder had been committed, of which the perpetrator was unknown, the elders of the nearest city were required to bring a heifer, which had never been used, to a field which had never been sown nor reaped, and strike off its neck, and wash their hands over the

\* So De Wette, *Opusc. Crit.*, p. 30; also Witsius, *Æcon. Fæd.*, p. 513.

heifer that was beheaded, saying, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it." On this custom we have been surprised to see the remark of so distinguished a critic as De Wette, "that he does not know what is meant by the washing of hands over the head of the animal, except it be to wash away the fault, and transfer it to the head of the heifer." On the contrary, the design of the washing of hands by the elders of the city was to show that they had no fault to transfer; that they were innocent of the murder; that "their hands had not shed the blood, nor their eyes seen it." So the Psalmist says, "I will wash my hands in innocence." So of Pilate, we read that "he took water and washed his hands, saying, I am innocent of this blood. See ye to it." The washing of the hands over the head of the slain heifer was probably symbolical of an imprecation, as in the covenant sacrifice, of the vengeance of God, if the elders or the city which they represented were guilty of the murder, or acquainted with its perpetrators. So it has been said that the most binding oath among the Chinese is accompanied with the cutting off the head of a cock.

IX. In regard to the names of *sin-offerings* and *trespass-offerings*, viz. חטאת and עושה, *sins* and *trespasses*, they appear to denote simply the object for which such sacrifices were made, viz. to obtain forgiveness of sins; just as *thank-offerings* were called *requitals* or *thanks*, because they were designed as a help in giving thanks; a stronger expression of gratitude than could be given by words. The argument for transferred guilt and vicarious punishment which has been drawn from the *names* of the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings is too weak to need refutation.

We have thus shown that the idea of vicarious punishment does not appear to have been connected with sacrifices for sin, either really or symbolically, so far as the Old Testament gives us information on the subject. But the advocates of the doctrine that the death of Christ was a vicarious punishment for the sins of the human race have not confined themselves to the Bible in their search for arguments for its support. They have sought to strengthen their argument by referring us to the history of Grecian, Egyptian, German, and modern

Jewish superstition. We have already shown that the prevailing idea attached to sacrifices for sin, as well as other sacrifices, by all nations, was that of *precious gifts*, by which they supposed the anger of the gods might be averted or their forgiveness obtained. But it would be singular if, among the manifold superstitions of different ages and nations, that of the actual or symbolical transfer of guilt and punishment from the offender to the victim offered should not have existed. Thus Servius relates, "that the Massilians, as often as they were afflicted with a pestilence, used to maintain some poor man a year at the public expense, feed him with all kinds of delicacies, and then lead him about the city with imprecations, that upon him all the calamities of the city might fall, and then cast him forth." The same custom, according to Suidas, in his explanation of the word *περίφημα*, prevailed among some of the ancient Greeks. We strongly suspect that this was in the expiring age of human sacrifices, when, instead of the best and dearest, the very dregs of the people were offered; just as by the Jews, in the time of the prophet Malachi, the blind and the lame instead of the best animals were offered. We are confirmed in this view by Dr. Schmitz, the author of the article *Sacrificium* in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, the latest and most valuable work on the subject: —

"The custom of sacrificing human life to the gods," says he, "arose undoubtedly from the belief, which, under different forms, has manifested itself at all times and in all nations, that the nobler the sacrifice and the dearer to its possessor, the more pleasing it would be to the gods. Hence the frequent instances in Grecian story of persons sacrificing their own children to the gods of the lower world. In later times, however, persons sacrificed to the gods were generally criminals, who had been condemned to death."

The history of Grecian sacrifices given in the article here quoted is strongly against the view that sacrifices for sin were regarded either as actual or symbolical punishments.

The history of sacrifices among the Germans seems to contain nothing inconsistent with the views which we have maintained. Thorpe, a learned English scholar of the present day, in his recent work on Northern mythology, thus speaks of the German sacrifices: —



“With prayer, sacrifice, which formed the chief part of the heathen worship, was inseparably connected. In general there was prayer only at the sacrifices. The principal sacrifice was a human one, the offering of which by all the Germanic races is fully proved. Human beings appear chiefly to have served for sacrifices of atonement, and were either offered to the malign deities, or as propitiatory to the dead in another world. The custom of burning the servants and horses with the corpse must therefore be understood as a propitiatory sacrifice to the shade of the departed.”

Thorpe also tells us, that

“The baked image of a sacrificial animal was sometimes offered to the gods in the stead of a real one. Similar usages are known to us among the Greeks and Romans; and in Sweden, even in recent times, it was a custom on Christmas eve to bake cakes in the form of a hog.”

We have no reason, then, to suppose that sacrifices were regarded as real or symbolical punishments among the Germans, any more than among the Greeks and Jews. But among the sacrifices of the Egyptians there is one which, if the account of Herodotus is to be trusted, seems to denote the actual or symbolical transfer of guilt and punishment from the offenders to the animal, which was probably an ox.

“Having,” says Herodotus, “brought the marked animal to the altar of sacrifice, they kindle a fire, and then, having poured wine upon the victim and called upon the god, they kill it. Having killed it, they cut off the head. They then take off the skin from the body, and, having made many imprecations against the head,” they sell it to Greek merchants, or cast it into the Nile. “The imprecation which they use over the head is this: that, if any calamity were about to befall either the sacrificers themselves or the land of Egypt generally, it might fall on this head.”\*

But this case of apparent transfer of real or symbolical punishment from a man or people to animals, in Egypt, cannot be regarded as of much weight in determining the meaning of the Jewish sacrifices, especially as the scape-goat, so called, of the Jews, which bears some resemblance to it, was not sacrificed, but sent alive and uninjured into the wilderness, as a token of the removal, not the punishment, of sins.

---

\* Euterpe, c. 39.

One more argument which has been made use of by those who regard the Jewish sacrifices as real or symbolical vicarious punishments, we should pass over as undeserving consideration, were it not for our purpose to notice everything which has been considered of importance by the advocates of the view which we have endeavored to refute. We allude to the practice which has prevailed among some modern Jews of sacrificing a cock or a hen as a sin-offering. Buxtorf gives an account of it in his *Synagoga Judaica*, p. 508 et seq., and Allen in his *Modern Judaism*.

“On the great day of atonement all the males take a cock, the females a hen, and a pregnant woman a cock and a hen. He who performs the ceremony of sacrifice strikes the bird three times in the head, saying every time, Let this bird be a substitute for me, let it come into my place, let it be an expiation for me; let death be to this bird but a happy life to me and all Israel; amen! Then, putting his hands on the bird, he kills it, having drawn the skin round its neck so as to strangle it, and thinks within himself that he ought to be strangled like the bird, but that he substitutes it in his place. Then he cuts its throat with a knife, thinking within himself that he deserves to be slain with a sword. Then he throws it with violence to the ground, thinking within himself that he ought to be stoned. Finally, he cooks it, to show that he himself ought to perish by fire. They then throw the entrails on the top of the house, that the crows may come and carry them, representing internal sins, into the wilderness. At one time they gave the body to the poor; but they complaining that they should thus eat the sins of the rich, they gave the value of the animal in alms, and then roasted or boiled it, and made a pleasant meal of it.”

So says Buxtorf. The date of the superstition is not given by him, nor the extent to which it prevailed. He only says that in Italy and the East it was regarded as a superstition, and was going out of use.

We cannot believe this superstition of the modern Jews to be entitled to any weight in determining the significance of the ancient Jewish sacrifices. After the lapse of one or two thousand years, it might well happen that sacrifices, instead of being considered as precious gifts, offered to the Deity with the view of obtaining forgiveness of sin and reconciliation, might come to be regarded by some persons or communities as receiving the guilt and suffering the punishment of the sinner, or as

symbolizing his guilt and punishment. This would be so natural a process in the progress of superstition, that we cannot regard the account given by Buxtorf as the *traditional* exposition of the significance of sacrifices, in opposition to the valid arguments which we have given for a different view of it. On the contrary, if the ancient sacrifices had such a meaning as seems to be indicated in the modern Jewish superstition, why were not the same forms and the same language, implying actual or symbolical punishment, used in the Old Testament? Indeed, the bringing forward of this modern superstition for the purpose of showing the significance of the Jewish sacrifices, as understood by Moses or by St. Paul, appears to us to be an indication of a desperate cause. We thus, in view of all that has been said on both sides of the question, come, on critical grounds, to the same conclusion at which Maurice arrived by a somewhat different process, that sacrifices for sin were not regarded by the ancient Jews as suffering or symbolizing vicarious punishment. We are happy to be supported in this conclusion by so sagacious an inquirer as Dr. Bushnell, who says:—

“The representation that the victim, in the ancient sacrifices, had its atoning power in virtue of the suffering put upon it, is favored by no word of the ancient Hebrew literature. On the contrary, the atoning power of the victim stands connected rather with the pains or painstaking expense of the owner himself, who in this manner signified his wish to make amends to God for the desecration of law and duty by sin.”\*

Before we come to the consideration of the bearing of the important conclusion which, by a critical examination of the Jewish sacrifices, we have thus reached, on the sense in which Christ is represented as a propitiatory sacrifice by the Apostles, we wish to devote a brief space to the question, whether the Jewish sacrifices had a *prophetic* import; whether they were expressly designed as prophetic types of a great future sacrifice, that of Christ, which gave them all their value and efficacy. Were it not for the strange views which have prevailed and still prevail in the Christian Church, we should consider the affirmative of this question too unfounded and fanciful

---

\* Christ in Theology, p. 284.

to merit consideration. But the design of our article would not be answered by passing it over with a mere word of contempt. We deny, then, that the Jewish sacrifices had any such prophetic import. 1. Because there is no evidence of it in the Old Testament. Not a syllable was uttered by the Jewish lawgiver, or by any prophet, or by any person who offered a sacrifice, that he understood it to be prophetic of the great future sacrifice of the Messiah. Now, if the Jewish sacrifices had such a prophetic import, which gave them all their value and efficacy, is it credible that it should not once have been alluded to in the Old Testament? 2. The Jewish sacrifices had no natural force or expression to indicate the death of a man. Human sacrifices were regarded by the Jews with horror. They were regarded as heathenish. The slaughter of an animal was not adapted to suggest the sacrifice of a man, especially to the Jewish mind. 3. The design which is expressly assigned to the sacrifices for sin is inconsistent with such a prophetic import. This design is over and over again said to be, to make atonement or reconciliation, to procure forgiveness of sin. It was not to furnish a prophetic symbol of a future sacrifice which should make atonement, but actually to make atonement. 4. When the prophets of the Old Testament complain of a misuse of the Jewish sacrifices, it is not that their prophetic reference to the future sacrifice of the Messiah is lost sight of. The complaint always is, that the moral purpose of sacrifices is lost sight of; that they are not accompanied with those feelings, that faith in God, and that true repentance for sin, which they were designed to express and to produce, and without which they were an abomination. This consideration alone is sufficient to convince one who duly weighs it, that the idea that the sacrifice of the Messiah was prophetically indicated by any Jewish sacrifice never crossed the mind of any of the Old Testament prophets. 5. The fact that similar sacrifices to those of the Jews have prevailed in almost all nations of the world, in a similar state of cultivation, shows that the Jewish sacrifices ought not to be regarded as having a prophetic import, rather than those of any other nation, unless such an import is expressly assigned to them in the Old Testament. 6. There are no passages in the New Testa-



ment which assert or imply that the Jewish sacrifices had such a prophetic import. There are one or two passages which have been misinterpreted so as to favor such an idea. Thus, in Col. ii. 17, the ordinances of the Law generally relating to meats, drinks, fast-days, and Sabbaths are said to be "a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's." But even so orthodox a critic as Bloomfield remarks on this passage, that

"It is not to be understood that these and all other ritual institutions of the Law of Moses shadowed forth some Christian mystery, but only, as the best expositors are generally agreed, that they were as mere shadows compared to that solid and substantial truth which Christ by his Gospel hath discovered to us."\*

So also in the Epistle to the Hebrews, x. 1, we read, "the Law having a shadow † of the good things to come, and not the very image of the things," etc. But it is plain from ix. 11, and from the connection, that by "the good things to come" were meant the things of the heavenly world which were objects of desire and expectation to the Christian. And the design of the writer is to affirm that the Law contained only an imperfect, shadowy outline of the things of the heavenly world, and gave no express image, no perfect representation, of them, as Christ did. The assertion of the writer is, that Judaism was very imperfect when compared with Christianity, not that one was a prophetic type of the other.

"The allusion," says Dr. Doddridge, "is to the different state of a painting, when the first sketch only is drawn, and when the piece is finished; or to the first sketch of a painting, when compared with what is yet more expressive than the completest painting, an exact image. . . . Even under the Gospel we have not the heavenly blessings themselves, but only a clearer representation, or revelation, of them."

This explanation seems to have been borrowed from Calvin's note on the verse, who says:—

"Similitudinem hanc mutuatus est ab arte pictoriâ. — Hoc ergo discrimen inter Legem et Evangelium statuit apostolus, quod sub illâ rudibus duntaxat et inchoatis lineis fuit adumbratum,

---

\* See Bloomfield's *New Testament*, *ad loc.*

† What the writer meant by the Law's containing a shadowy outline of the heavenly world may probably be learned from Philo, *De Vita Mosis*, Lib. III. See also Heb. viii. 5.

quod hodie vivis et graphice distinctis coloribus expressum est. Hoc modo iterum confirmat quod prius dixit, non otiosam fuisse Legem, nec inanes ejus cœremonias. Nam etsi non fuit illic rerum cœlestium effigies, quasi extremâ (quod aiunt) artificis manu absoluta, tamen illa qualiscunque indicatio Patribus non parum utilis fuit, etiamsi nostra conditio sit potior. — Futura bona pro æternis dici puto. Hoc nunc agitat, non Veteris modo Testamenti respectu futura bona dici; sed quia a nobis adhuc quoque sperantur." See Calvin's Comment. *ad loc.*

So Hammond: —

"For the Mosaical Law, which contained no more than an imperfect shadow, or rude first draught, of those mercies made over to us by the Gospel, eternal life, &c., and not the lively representation or effigies of them, such as the Gospel now affords us," &c.

We have, then, in these and similar passages, no intimations that the Law was designed to prefigure the facts of Christianity, or that any of the sacrifices had a prophetic import. Indeed, the reasoning of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to be decidedly against that fiction of theologians. For if the Jewish sacrifices really had a prophetic import, present to the minds of those that offered them, why was faith in the actual sacrifice of Christ so much better than faith in it as a future event?

7. But it may be asked, whether the sacrifice of Christ may not have had a retrospective effect on the Jewish sacrifices, so as to give efficacy to them, though the offerers were unconscious of any relation of one to the other. To this we answer, first, that such a retrospective influence is inconceivable to reason; and secondly, that it is unscriptural in two ways. In the first place, no such retrospective influence on the Jewish sacrifices is ascribed in the New Testament to the death of Christ, and in the second place, no influence whatever is ascribed to the death of Christ except in connection with faith. But it is certain that the Jews, when they offered their sacrifices, could not have had faith in a future sacrifice of Christ, of which they had no knowledge whatever. Neither could the fact, that Christ was the lamb slain, i. e. designed to be slain, from the foundation of the world, have any influence on those to whom the secret purpose of God had not been revealed.

8. But it may be said, that, though the Jewish sacrifices had not a prophetic import to the minds of those who offered them, they may have had such an import, which was designed to be understood by Christians when Christ should have fulfilled it. But this is to suppose that the prophetic import of the sacrifice was not known till it was useless. For when the reality had actually come, of what use was it to know that a prophetic symbol of it existed ages before? If the alleged typical or prophetic import of the Jewish sacrifices were real and of any value, it must have been designed for those who offered them, and not for those who make allusions to them, hundreds of years afterwards? Who can believe that the Supreme Being would have assigned a prophetic import to sacrifices, which import was never discovered till it was of no use, i. e. till men had received the antitype, the reality, signified by it? When men had received Christ, when they actually enjoyed the benefits of his life and death, of what use to them would be the prophetic import of the type? It might recommend Christianity to Jews or Jewish Christians, to point out analogies more or less close between the death of Christ and the Jewish sacrifices. But this would have no connection with any typical or prophetic import in them.

It may be well to notice one more view which has been given of the design of the Jewish sacrifices, and thus show our respect for the distinguished minister from Connecticut, who, in his discourse before the Divinity School at Cambridge, gave so ample a refutation of every form of the Calvinistic or vicarious penal atonement.

"In sacrifices," says Dr. Bushnell, "are prepared correspondences, and so, types or bases of language, in which the more spiritual grace of Christ may be represented." \*

Again:—

"The positive institutions, rites, historic processes of the antichristian ages are all so many preparations made by the transcendent wisdom of God with a secret design to bring forth, when it was wanted, a Divine form for the Christian truth." †

---

\* God in Christ, p. 224.

† Ibid., p. 249.

Again: —

“It is expressly declared in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is tacitly assumed elsewhere, that the old system had a certain relationship to the contents of the new. Not, as the old theologians somewhat childishly conceived, that the types of the Old Testament ritual showed the saints of that age the Christ to come; but that by means of this ritual the national mind was impregnated with forms, impressions, associations, not derivative from nature, which, when the Christian ideas are born, are to become types or bases of a language to convey them.” \*

As we agree with Dr. Bushnell in all the essential points of his Discourse at Cambridge, we are sorry to differ with him in a matter of less importance. But we cannot think his view to be at all tenable on the ground of Scripture or reason. As to what he says on certain passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that they declare that “the Old system had a certain relationship to the contents of the New,” it by no means follows from this, that they support his peculiar theory. His theory is, that the Old Testament forms were designed to furnish a terminology for the writers of the New. But this is nowhere declared; and how he could discover “the secret design of God,” except by express revelation, it is difficult to perceive. We have already shown, and fortified our view by quotations from various writers, ancient and modern, that the sacrifices of the Jews were sanctioned by the Deity for a very different purpose from that which Dr. Bushnell supposes. He has himself well said, in another passage less savoring of mere theory, that “the value of the sacrifice terminated principally in the power it had over the religious character, — in the impressions, exercises, aids, and principles which, as a liturgy, it wrought in the soul of the worshipper.” † So far, then, as the Scriptures give us information, the sacrifices of the Jews were not for the purpose of furnishing a terminology for Christians, as maintained by Dr. Bushnell, but for a very different purpose. And on the ground of reason, it appears to us that little can be said in favor of this theory. It makes too much to depend on the mere artificial language in which facts and ideas are expressed. We can readily conceive that the use of sacrificial lan-

---

\* God in Christ, p. 259.

† Ibid., p. 225.



guage in presenting the facts concerning the life and death of Christ might have an affecting influence on the Jews and Jewish Christians to whom Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews wrote. They had from infancy been familiar with sacrifices and sacrificial ideas. They had associations and feelings connected with sacrifices, which it is impossible for any one at the present day to have. But how can mere sacrificial language be so very expressive to those to whom the sacrificial system has become obsolete? When we have all the facts before the mind, as to what Christ was, as to what he said, as to what he did, and as to what he suffered, how can it be deemed as of sufficient importance to require a miraculous provision of the Deity for preparing a symbolic language in which these facts should be expressed? Or how can it be deemed rational, that *language* borrowed from rites and customs which have been done away should be regarded as peculiarly Divine? Some Christians, accustomed to such language from infancy, and taught to believe the use of it necessary to their salvation, may think themselves edified by it, or be edified by it. But one who has received so much intellectual culture as to be able to distinguish ideas and things from the mere words which convey them, must find it intolerably irksome to be tied down to any particular "terminology," or "objective mystic forms of the altar."

Another objection to the theory of Dr. Bushnell is, that a very small part of the Jewish ritual can, with the utmost stretch of fancy, be made to express Christian ideas, or ever has been so used. How much, then, of the Jewish ritual did the secret design of God "to prepare moulds or types for Christian ideas" apply to? Was it limited to sacrifices for sin, or did it extend to every minute ceremony of the ritual? To select these sacrifices alone out of the whole Jewish ritual as "the prepared mould for Christian ideas," seems to be in the highest degree arbitrary.

Dr. Bushnell remarks in behalf of his peculiar theory, that the faith and feelings of a Christian need certain objective forms, on which they may fasten. Very well. But why should the forms of a religious system which has been done away be retained for a new one? Why

put new wine into old bottles? Why confine Christian ideas to fixed moulds, assumed to have been manufactured for them ages before they had an existence. Has not Christianity itself enough that is objective? Are not Christ himself, and the facts of his life, death, and resurrection, as truly objective as sacrificial language? Is not the cross objective? But the cross itself has nothing to do with the altar form. We are not urging objections to the use of sacrificial language in relation to the work and sufferings of Christ, when it is the natural and unstudied language of Christian faith and feeling. Our objections are to the theory that "Aaron's old wardrobe" was expressly designed by the Deity to be the perpetual clothing of Christian ideas, and that every Christian is under obligation to labor continually to cast his ideas into sacrificial moulds, as if expressly prepared by God for the purpose. Such a labor seems to us to have a tendency to sink the spirit which giveth life in the letter which killeth, or, in the still stronger language of the Apostle of the Gentiles, to carry us back to the "beggary elements" of Judaism. It is a step in the same direction with the mimic sacrifice of the Roman Catholics in the celebration of mass.

The important bearing of the true meaning of the Jewish sacrifices on the language and doctrines of the New Testament will, we trust, be our justification for having gone through with what may seem to many a tediously minute inquiry. We know that just views of the sufferings and death of our Saviour in their influence upon the salvation of man may be gained in a more compendious way. But it is our aim to take away one of the chief supports on which the false views of many theologians have rested; we mean the imagined vicarious import of the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and the imagined necessity of clothing our thoughts of Christ in language borrowed from the altar service of the Hebrews.

All admit that Christ is by the writers of the New Testament called a sacrifice. All Christians unite in regarding him as, in some sense, the true sacrifice, who takes away the sin of the world, — the true sacrifice, in consequence of which sins have been forgiven, and man reconciled to God. But respecting the sense in which

Christ is represented by the New Testament writers as a sacrifice, there has been great doubt and disagreement among Christians. Now, if the view which we have given of the significance of the Jewish sacrifices be correct, — if the animals sacrificed for sin under the Jewish dispensation were not regarded as bearing, or even symbolizing, the punishment of the offenders, but only as an appointed means of manifesting a sense of sin and a desire for forgiveness, and as a means of obtaining assurance of Divine forgiveness, — then it follows that the dogma of the infliction by the Deity of vicarious punishment upon Christ for the sins which he did not commit, has no foundation in the sacrificial language applied to him by the Apostles. Whatever may be the true sense in which Christ is represented as a sacrifice in the New Testament, it follows from our view of the significance of the Jewish sacrifices, that the Apostles could not mean that he endured the threatened penalty of human transgression, — that he received the punishment due to the guilty, — whether, as Calvin supposed, by experiencing after death the torments of hell,\* or by the immediate infliction of the wrath of God on the head of his beloved Son in this world. It is to be presumed that the Apostles, when they applied sacrificial language to the death of Christ, had correct views of its import. And we have seen that, whatever may be the significance of the Jewish sacrifices, they do not import vicarious punishment. Now if this irrational and unscriptural idea of atonement by the vicarious punishment of Christ could be banished from Christian theology, the remaining difference among Christians respecting the true import of the sacrifice of Christ would be comparatively unim-

---

\* Thus, in his Institutes, Book II. Ch. XVI., Calvin, speaking of the descent into hell, says: "If Christ had merely died a corporeal death, no end would have been accomplished by it; it was requisite, also, that he should feel the severity of the Divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God and satisfy his justice. Hence it was necessary for him to contend with the powers of hell and the horrors of eternal death. . . . For the relation of those sufferings of Christ which were visible to men is very properly followed by that invisible and incomprehensible vengeance which he suffered from the hand of God; in order to assure us that not only the body of Christ was given as the price of our redemption, but that there was another greater and more excellent ransom, since he suffered in his soul the dreadful torments of a person condemned and irrecoverably lost."

portant. Other views, somewhat mystical, might prevail, which would not be at war with the eternal principles of Divine and human justice. It is the idea of punishment by proxy, of innocence taking the place of guilt, that has been a foul blot on our holy religion, corrupting its friends and strengthening its enemies.

Still it may be well to make a few remarks on the use of sacrificial language in the New Testament. In the first place, we call attention to the remarkable fact, — remarkable when we consider what theories have prevailed in the Church, — that our Saviour never compared himself, or his death, to a sacrifice for sin in any sense, figurative or literal. He often speaks of his death by violence, as certain, as in conformity with the will of God, and as the means of breaking down the reign of evil, and establishing the kingdom of God in the world. But he never speaks of himself as a sacrifice for sin, a sin-offering. He calls himself the good Shepherd, who lays down his life for the benefit, not in the place, of the sheep. He says that only those who eat his flesh and drink his blood shall have life. He says that he came to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many, i. e. a means of delivering many from the bondage of sin. He compares himself to the brazen serpent lifted up on a pole, to which the serpent-bitten Israelites looked for deliverance. But the brazen serpent was no sacrifice, much less an example of vicarious punishment. In one place only he compares his death to a sacrifice, but, in this case, to a covenant sacrifice, — a sacrifice by which covenants used to be confirmed. "This cup is," i. e. denotes, "the blood of the new covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins." That in this last expression, "for the remission of sins," no sacrificial efficacy is included, is evident from the circumstance that the same phrase is connected with baptism, which is called the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. Jesus thus speaks of his death in plain terms, and under various figures; but makes no allusions to sacrifices for sin. This is certainly a very remarkable fact, if his death was a literal sin-offering in the Jewish sense, and if this be a fundamental doctrine of his religion. He not only does not use sacrificial language in reference to his death, but uses many expressions of a different import. "I, if I be



lifted on high from the earth, *shall draw* all men unto me." John xii. 32. "Now," i. e. in immediate view of his death, "is the prince of this world cast out." When he tells his Apostles (John xvi. 7) that "it is expedient for them that he should go away," it is not on account of the sacrificial nature of his death, but that the Comforter may come. Again, he says, "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go to the Father; for my Father is greater than I"; i. e. he can do more for my cause than I by remaining in the world. He gives prominence to the idea that his religion is a religion of the spirit. Under its influence the true worshippers were to worship *in spirit and in truth*. In John vi. 63, he says, "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing." When the teacher of the Law said to him, that to love God with all the heart was more than whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices, he replied, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God." The parables of the lost sheep, the lost pieces of money, and especially of the prodigal son, if well considered, make it impossible to suppose that Christ believed that the forgiveness of God to the penitent depended on any sacrificial view of his death, much less on the view that it was the vicarious punishment of sin. What we have said of the letter and spirit of Christ's teaching undermines also the hypothesis of Dr. Bushnell. For if the ancient sacrifices for sin were specially designed by the Deity to be a sort of mould, or symbolical language, with which to express Christian ideas, how remarkable it is that the Author of Christian ideas did not use it in either a literal or figurative sense! How very remarkable, when we consider to what an extent it was his wont to use symbolical language! How improbable that the Founder of Christianity should leave out of his instructions an essential part of his religion!

In the Epistles of the New Testament the death of Christ is alluded to in language borrowed from the Jewish sacrifices. The presumption is, that their views accord with those of Christ, and that they regarded the truest fulfilment of the Jewish sacrifices to take place, when Christians presented themselves living sacrifices to God, a spiritual, not a ritual service. But we will consider separately what ideas or feelings they meant

to express when they used the sacrificial language in question.

It has been made a question of great importance, whether the Apostles regarded the death of Christ as a literal or figurative sacrifice. To us it seems not to have been noticed by writers on either side, as it ought to have been, that, so far as the question whether the atonement by Christ was effected by his vicarious punishment is concerned, it is of little importance whether the death of Christ was regarded by the Apostles as a literal or figurative sacrifice; and this for two reasons. First, because, according to the true view of the significance of sacrifices for sin, they had no vicarious import. They were not regarded as a punishment by substitute, nor as symbolical of the punishment of the offender. They were gifts expressive of self-denial, designed to aid those whose consciences were burdened by sin to express their penitence and prayers for forgiveness, and thus to procure peace of conscience and a sense of being forgiven, when these offerings were accompanied with faith and penitence, and followed by obedience. If, therefore, the Apostles regarded the death of Christ as ever so literal a sacrifice, they could not, on this true view of the significance of Jewish sacrifices, have regarded it as a judicial vicarious punishment for the sins of men. Secondly, it seems to us that we shall arrive at the same result, if we take the other view of the significance of sacrifices for sin, which we have shown to be unfounded, namely, that the sacrificed animals were symbolical of the guilt and punishment of those that offered them. For on this view the sacrifices for sin were only *symbols* of ideas; of the ideas of guilt, demerit, and punishment. If, then, the death of Christ was a literal sacrifice, as Magee and others have maintained, then it follows that the death of Christ was only a *symbol* of the punishment which the wicked deserve. The more literal a sacrifice the death of Christ was, the less can it be regarded as an actual vicarious punishment. For the most orthodox writers do not maintain that the Jewish sacrifices for sin were actual vicarious punishments, but only symbols or emblems of punishment. Of course, then, the more the death of Christ was like them, the more literal a sacrifice it was, the more reason have we to believe, even on

that view of the significance of sacrifices for sin which we have opposed, that the design of it was simply to display the evil of sin, and the punishment which it deserved. In this case there would be no endurance of actual vicarious punishment, no suffering of the penalty of the law, no experience of the wrath of God, but only an expressive symbol, designed to exert an influence on the minds of those who should contemplate it. The doctrine of atonement by the vicarious punishment of Christ disappears, therefore, as really and truly on the ground that Christ was a literal sacrifice, as on that of the figurative interpretation. This we regard as an important view of the subject, and one which has not been set forth as it ought to be. For the doctrine of atonement by vicarious punishment has derived its chief support, first, by assuming that the Jewish sacrifices were symbolical of vicarious punishment; secondly, by assuming that the death of Christ was a literal sacrifice; and thirdly, by setting aside, with a sort of legerdemain, the *symbolical* character ascribed to the Jewish sacrifices, and assuming that the sacrifice of Christ was a real vicarious punishment, an actual endurance of the penalty of the law threatened against transgressors, an actual endurance of the pains of hell. Surely, those who hold that the death of Christ was a literal sacrifice ought, in consistency, to hold that it was only a symbolical punishment, an expression of certain ideas, exercising no influence except on the minds of those who contemplate it.

We have said that, so far as the doctrine of atonement by the vicarious punishment of Christ is concerned, it is immaterial whether the Apostles regarded the death of Christ as a literal or a figurative sacrifice, or whether they held that view of the significance of sacrifices which we have maintained, or that which we have opposed. But on other accounts we do think it of great importance. The idea that it was the express and immediate design of God, that Christ should be sacrificed as a symbol of the punishment which the wicked deserve, or that it was the express design of Christ, in giving himself for us, to exhibit himself as a symbol of this punishment, appears to us to be derogatory to the character of God and of Christ, and to have a tendency to weaken the influence which the death of the Saviour

ought to exercise upon the mind and heart. It appears to us to be essential to the proper influence of the sufferings and death of Christ on the mind and heart, that they should be regarded as incidental to his mission, as incurred in the way of accomplishing it, and not expressly designed to have a symbolical meaning, or to express certain ideas in an impressive manner. On this point Dr. Bushnell has written with such force and clearness that we prefer his language to our own.

"It is to be noticed as a law of expression, that when evil is endured simply and only for what it expresses, it expresses nothing. If a man wades out upon some mountain in the snows of a wintry night, to carry food to a perishing family, then what he encounters of risk and suffering, being incidentally incurred, is an expression of charity. But if he call upon us to observe his charity expressed in what he will suffer, and, waiting for a stormy night, goes forth on the same expedition to the mountain, he expresses nothing but ostentation. So if Christ comes into the world to teach, to cheer, to heal, to pour his sympathies into the bosom of all human sorrow, to assert the integrity of truth, and rebuke the wickedness of sin, in a word, to manifest the eternal life, and bring it into a quickening union with the souls of our race, then to suffer incidentally, to die an ignominious and cruel death, rather than depart from his heavenly errand, is to make an expression of the heart of God, which every human soul must feel. And this expression may avail to sanctify the law before us, even though there be no abhorrence expressed in his sufferings. But if Christ comes into the world invoking, as it were, the power of God, and undertaking to suffer evil as evil, that he may express God's justice, or his abhorrence of sin, then he expresses nothing. The very laws of expression, if I understand them rightly, require that suffering should be endured, not as suffering, or as evil taken up for the expression of it, but that the evil be a necessary incident encountered *on the way* to some end separate from expression, — some truth, benefaction, or work of love."\*

And now the question recurs, What was the meaning of the Apostles, when they represent the death of Christ as a sacrifice? Was their language literal or figurative? What if the truth should be that it was not literal, and yet something more than figurative in the usual sense of the term. Christ was crucified by Roman soldiers, by the order of Pontius Pilate, instigated by the Jews.

---

\* God in Christ, pp. 201, 202.



There was no altar, no priest; in short, none of the ceremonies which the Jews regarded as essential to a sacrifice. How, then, could converts from Judaism, like Paul, Peter, and John, regard him, whom the Jews by wicked hands had crucified and slain, as a literal sacrifice?

On the other hand, Does not the language of the Apostles imply that they connected some sacrificial ideas and feelings with the death of Christ? They certainly regarded Christ's voluntary death in the cause of truth, duty, and human salvation, as being by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. They, as well as Christ himself, regarded it as essential to the fulfilment of the Divine purposes. He was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. Now, allowing that the direct or immediate design of Christ's death, as it existed in his own consciousness, the end for which he was born and for which he was sent into the world, was "to bear witness to the truth," to establish "the new covenant by his blood," "to draw all men unto him" by being lifted up on the cross, to touch their hearts and move them to penitence and love, "to cast out the prince of this world," or break down the reign of evil, and establish God's kingdom of truth and righteousness, yet who shall limit the purposes of God to these effects of the death of Jesus? Who shall say that the death by suffering and torture of a man, filled with the spirit of God without measure, distinguished by the miracles which God gave him the power to perform, and the mission of truth which God raised him up to discharge, in whom was no sin, who made it his meat and drink to please God, and who by his powers and character, if not by a higher nature, was well entitled to the appellation of Son of God, may not have been designed, under the providential government of God, to illustrate the Divine character, as an object of direct contemplation? Surely something respecting the character of God is revealed in the events which God permits, or which he ordains, in the accomplishment of his benevolent purposes? Who shall say that the sufferings and death of Christ were not incidentally designed to express and to awaken thoughts and feelings, and to accomplish an end, so analogous to what was designed by the Jewish sacrifices, that the Apostles connected sacrificial ideas

and feelings with them; and thus regarded Christ as "set forth to be a propitiatory sacrifice" in something more than a figurative sense, which admits of definite explanation? Who shall say that the sufferings and death of Christ as of all righteous men\* for the benefit of the race, were not incidentally designed to declare God's righteousness and love, to express God's hatred of sin and love of holiness, and at the same time to pacify the conscience by a sense of his forgiveness?

All Christians unite in believing that the death of Christ was a direct manifestation of Divine love. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins." "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God toward us, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord." "He that spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?" But some have found a difficulty in the representation of the Apostle Paul, that by setting forth Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice God has manifested his own righteousness. But does not the fact that God suffered so pure and righteous a being as Christ, his own Son, to suffer and die in the cause of righteousness, show how great an evil he regards unrighteousness or sin to be, and how great a good he regards righteousness or holiness to be. What is it to declare God's righteousness, but to declare that he loves righteousness and hates iniquity? If God did not love righteousness and hate iniquity, would he suffer righteous men, and especially so righteous a being as Christ, to suffer and die in order to secure the one and put an end to the other? Does not the cost, the precious blood, by which God establishes righteousness in the earth, declare his own righteousness. Now as the ancient sacrifices were designed to manifest both the righteousness and the mercy of God, as sin-offerings were brought under a sense of sin against that God who hates sin and loves holiness, and thus expressed a desire for forgiveness on the

---

\* Comp. Phil. ii. 17; Col. i. 24; Is. liiii. 5.

part of him that offered them, and conveyed a sense of forgiveness when offered with right feelings, how natural it was for the Apostles to express their thoughts and feelings respecting the death of Christ in the language of sacrifice; that they should connect some sacrificial views and feelings with their contemplation of the influence of his sufferings and death! The purposes which were included in the design of the Jewish sacrifices had been more effectually secured in their case by Christ, especially by that which most touched their hearts, as the consummation of his life and religion, his death upon the cross. They had become penitent, they had exercised faith in the righteousness and mercy of God, as manifested therein; they had obtained a delightful sense of Divine forgiveness. Christ had become their propitiatory sacrifice, and they felt an efficacy and a power in it which assured them that it did not need to be repeated. The contemplation of it was sufficient "to purge their consciences from dead works to serve the living God," and in an important sense "to make them perfect." We are not sure that they drew the line carefully between figurative and literal expressions. We are not sure that they, born Jews, accustomed to the sight of sacrifices from their infancy, may not have connected some mystic sacrificial ideas and feelings with the death of Christ, which it might be difficult for us moderns to express in definite and plain language.

On the other hand, we are equally sure that the language of sacrifice can convey nothing valuable at the present day, which is not suggested by a plain statement of all the facts relating to the life and death of Christ, independent of sacrificial language. When it is suggested naturally, let it be used like any other figurative or symbolical language. But if it be laid down as a dogma that sacrificial language must at all events be used as a necessary and essential mould for Christian ideas, we believe the result will be error and mischief. Especially will this be the case, if we connect with the Jewish sacrifices a meaning which the ancient Jews never saw in them, namely, that of transferred guilt, or punishment by proxy.

Did our limits permit, we should be glad to go into an examination of all the passages in the New Testament

in which the death of Christ is referred to as a sacrifice. But we will content ourselves with a few comments on two celebrated texts, one of which is in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, the other in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the author of which differs from Paul only in the extent to which he pursues the analogies between the Jewish and Christian dispensations.

What has been called Paul's standard text is in Rom. iii. 21-26. There is in the Common Version a mistranslation, caused by overlooking the distinction between the Greek terms *ἀφεις* and *πάρεσις* which was pointed out by Dr. Hammond, and is well illustrated by Trench in his recent useful publication on the New Testament Synonyms. We translate the passage thus:—

“But the righteousness which is of God, to which the Law and the Prophets have borne testimony, even the righteousness which is of God through faith in Christ Jesus, has now without the Law been made manifest to all and upon all who believe. For there is no distinction. For all have sinned and failed of obtaining the glory which is with God; being accepted as righteous freely, by his grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom, in his blood, through faith, God has set forth as a propitiatory sacrifice, in order to manifest his righteousness on account of his passing by, in his forbearance, the sins of former times; in order to manifest his righteousness at the present time, so that he may be [i. e. appear to be] righteous, and accept as righteous him who believes in Jesus.”

By “the righteousness which is of God,” verses 21 and 22, we understand the right moral and spiritual condition of a man who has faith in God as manifested in Christ, a faith of the heart as well as the head, which is said to be “of God,” or God's gift, because it is accepted by God in mercy, implying the gratuitous pardon of past sins, and not as a perfect obedience of the precepts of the Law. It is still righteousness, however, even as “Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness”; counted to him because he had it, and not because he had it not. To make *δικαιοσύνη* mean the mere act of God in pardoning sin, is against all Greek and Scripture usage of the term, and takes away just one half of the Apostle's meaning. The verb *δικαιώω* we translate to *accept as righteous*, i. e. to regard and treat as righteous; not to make righteous, in the sense of imparting moral excellence. This is contrary to the New



Testament usage of the word, as the lexicons and concordances will convince any one who will resort to them. So to make the term denote simply *to pardon* or *acquit* is to depart from New Testament usage, and to rob it of half its meaning.

By the expression "his righteousness," in verses 25 and 26, we understand righteousness as an attribute of God, that attribute in consequence of which he hates sin and loves holiness, and shows that he is not indifferent to the moral conduct of men. Could we allow ourselves to follow our theological bias, we might give some plausible reasons for understanding δικαιοσύνη as denoting *mercy*, or *goodness*, instead of righteousness, as so distinguished and orthodox a critic as Dr. Hammond understood the term. But we cannot regard such a meaning as sufficiently supported by New Testament usage, nor can we see why the Apostle should not have used the common Greek terms by which mercy, or goodness, or love is denoted, if such had been his meaning. On the other hand, we protest against prefixing the epithet "judicial" to this "righteousness," as if the only way in which God could manifest his righteousness was by inflicting punishment as a judge; and as if this passage meant that God manifested his righteousness by inflicting upon Christ the punishment of all the millions who had lived and died in their sins before his time. There is not a particle of evidence to show that Paul thought that the sufferings of Christ were greater in intensity than those which a man of sensibility would experience under similar circumstances to those in which he was placed, encountered in the way of his duty, and inflicted by Jewish malignity and cruelty. How, then, could the sufferings of one man, (this too on the Trinitarian as well as the Unitarian theory,) endured for a comparatively short time, be regarded as the punishment, or equivalent in pain to the punishment, of the sins of all the world? Even if reason could admit, or the Scriptures justify, the doctrine, that the righteous might be punished by the Deity in place of the guilty, who can convince himself that that punishment was endured by Christ. Especially what believer in the doctrine that endless misery is the threatened punishment of every transgressor, can imagine that that punishment was en-

duced by Christ, and this, too, not merely for one sinner, but for all sinners? We have already shown that the righteousness of God might be manifested by the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ in a very different way.

In arranging the phrases "through faith" and "in his blood" so as to make them both relate to "propitiatory sacrifice," we give them a more important connection, and avoid the expression "faith in his blood," which nowhere else occurs in the New Testament. Paul thus intimates that the blood of Christ constitutes him a propitiatory sacrifice, but that it is the faith of the Christian that makes it his sacrifice, — a sacrifice for his benefit. So Conybeare, Alford, Meyer, and De Wette.

In adopting the rendering "*propitiatory sacrifice*," we again remark, that, if we could follow our theological bias, we should choose the rendering "*mercy-seat*"; and in this case we should have the support of numerous Calvinistic as well as Unitarian critics. Any one who will turn to *ιαστήριον* in Robinson's or Schleusner's Lexicon will see that the term in itself considered admits of either translation, according as *θύμα*, *sacrifice*, or *ἐπίθεμα*, *cover*, is supposed to be the implied noun to be connected with the adjective *ιαστήριον*. But as the death of Christ is, in several passages of the New Testament, compared to a sacrifice, and never to the mercy-seat, unless this passage be an exception, we believe, with Professor Stuart and most modern critics, that "*propitiatory sacrifice*" is the true rendering. Besides, it cannot be denied that *ιαστήριον* is capable of being rendered *mercy-seat*, only because it denotes literally the *propitiatory lid*, or *cover* of the ark of the covenant; and this lid or cover was propitiatory, only because the blood of a sacrificed animal was sprinkled upon it. So that it is doubtful whether there will be much difference in the general meaning, whichever translation may be preferred, *whom God hath set forth as a propitiatory cover*, or *propitiatory sacrifice*.

This propitiatory sacrifice of Christ Paul does not define. But he tells us plainly what was in part its design. It was that of *manifestation*. It was expressive of the Divine mind. Its design on the part of God, as a fact in his supreme government of the world, was to accomplish what the Jewish sacrifices had accomplished in a less perfect manner; namely, to manifest his righteousness; to show

that he was a righteous Being, a Being not indifferent to the moral conduct of men, although he had "in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways,"\* and had "winked at the times of ignorance."† In the Common Version the distinction between *πάρεσις*, *passing by*, and *ἄφεσις*, *forgiveness*, ‡ is disregarded, and thus the sense of the passage is lost. The former refers to God's forbearance to the wicked, in suffering them to go on in their sins without adequate punishment; the latter, to his forgiveness to those who believed and repented. The meaning of the Apostle in the passage seems to be, that there was needed a signal manifestation of the righteousness of God, on account of his forbearance in passing over without adequate punishment the sins of mankind before the coming of Christ. § Such a signal manifestation of God's righteousness was given when he set forth his own Son to be a propitiatory sacrifice. His estimate of the evil of sin was to be inferred from the cost at which he undertook to deliver men from it. "He spared not his own Son, but freely gave him up for us all, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify for himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." || Would he have done it unless he had regarded iniquity as the most terrible of all evils, and righteousness the object of his supreme love? ¶ Such was the incidental significance of the death of Christ, considered as an event under God's moral government of the world, in addition to its direct moral consequences, as the seal of his ministry and consummation of his mission, in establishing his religion in the minds and hearts of men. It is possible, as we have intimated, that Paul may have connected some feelings, if not ideas, with what he calls the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, which we of the present day are unable to define or estimate. But to maintain that Christ could manifest the righteousness of God only by enduring the *punishment* of all the wicked who lived before his time, or what was equivalent to it in pain, is to

\* Acts xiv. 16.

† Acts xvii. 30.

‡ This distinction is well pointed out by Dr. Hammond *ad loc.*, and by Trench in his recent useful book on the Synonyms of the New Testament.

§ Comp. Hebrews ix. 15.

|| Romans viii. 32; Titus ii. 14.

¶ We cordially recommend to the inquirer additional illustrations of this topic by Dr. Bushnell, in his "God in Christ," pp. 225 - 238.

be rationalistic without being rational. It is to add to the meaning of Paul a monstrous theological fiction, contradicted by fact, by just views of the Jewish sacrifices, and by the pervading spirit of the Old Testament and the New. How incongruous is such a horrible view of the sufferings of our Saviour with another in reference to them by the same Apostle!—"Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice *for a savor of a sweet smell* to God."\*

The other passage to which we call the attention of the patient reader is in Hebrews ix. 11-15: "But Christ having appeared, the high-priest of the blessings which are to come, passing through that greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is, not of this creation, entered once for all into the most holy place, not with the blood of bulls and goats, but with his own blood, procuring for us eternal redemption. For if the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through an eternal spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify your consciences from dead works to the worship of the living God. And hence he is the Mediator of the new covenant, that, death having taken place to effect a redemption from the transgressions under the first covenant, they who were called may receive the promised eternal inheritance."

It is not our purpose to go into a full exposition of this striking passage, and attempt to point out all the mystic analogies which the writer has traced between the death of Christ and the sin-offerings of the Jews. But there are some things very prominent in this passage, as well as in the whole Epistle, which go to confirm the general views which we have endeavored to support, and which it is the design of Mr. Maurice's book to support. One is, that the superior efficacy of the sacrifice of Christ does not consist in the intensity, the measure, or the duration of the sufferings which he endured, but rather in the inward spirit which they expressed. There is no word in the passage under consideration, or in any other passage of the Epistle, which intimates that the

---

\* Ephesians v. 2.



punishment of the sins of men was to be endured or expressed either by the Jewish sacrifices, or by Christ. On the contrary, both are regarded as offerings or gifts to God. Indeed, the sacrifice of Christ is represented as offered by him after all his sufferings were over; after he had passed through the tabernacle of the skies into the holy of holies in heaven itself. Comp. iv. 4; viii. 2.

The difference which in this passage the writer puts between the Jewish sacrifices and that of Christ is, that the former were a mere outward shedding of blood, while the latter was an inward voluntary offering, a free surrender of the soul to the will of God. Comp. x. 7. Christ would not disobey his Father's will in order to avoid suffering. In the one case animals were offered which were only outwardly or physically stainless, and which could not offer themselves, but must be offered by others. Such sacrifices could be expected to give only an outward purity. In the other case the sacrifice was offered by a man, a moral agent, inwardly and spiritually blameless, a man filled with the spirit of love, and the sacrifice was the man himself. More than this, the sacrifice not only did not consist of an animal, which ceased to exist when it had once been put to death, but Christ offered himself as a sacrifice, in the possession without measure of that eternal spirit of God which exempted him from the power of death (comp. Rom. i. 4), and made him a perpetual intercessor, an eternal high-priest (comp. vii. 24, 25), able to succor them that are tempted (ii. 18). Now, the real and definite ideas which the writer meant to express by saying that Christ entered the holy of holies in heaven with his own blood, and by some other mystical and obscure analogies which he pursues between the old and new dispensation, we may not be able to point out. But the obvious drift of the whole passage is, that the sacrifice of Christ was a moral act of eternal significance, an act exhibiting that obedience which was better than sacrifice, and came in place of sacrifice (comp. ver. 8, 9), and which was adapted to exert a perpetual moral influence on the mind of the Christian believer, — "to purge his conscience from dead works," from a formal service destitute of faith and the spirit of life which is in Christ Jesus, "to the service of God who lives," and therefore requires the living spirit of faith and

obedience. All who are truly baptized to Christ, who through the eternal spirit which was ever with him offered himself without blemish to God, will feel their obligation "to present themselves, a living sacrifice, holy, well-pleasing to God, their spiritual worship."

G. R. N.

---

ART. VI.—KINGSLEY'S *SIR AMYAS LEIGH*.\*

IN his letter expository of the *Fairy Queen*, "safe, serious Spenser" assures his friend, "the right noble and valorous" Sir Walter Raleigh, "that the general end of all the book is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in all virtuous and gentle discipline."

With equal truth might Mr. Kingsley claim the credit of a kindred aim in the composition, not of "*Amyas Leigh*" alone, but of all those various and vigorous works which within the space of a few years have won for him a prominent and even a brilliant place in the eyes of the literary world on both sides of the Atlantic.

No man can read the *Fairy Queen* without feeling that Spenser wrote in serious earnest, that his poetry glows with purpose. Bunyan was not more sincere. Spenser's heart is in his high-flown words, and the most far-fetched conceits of his delicate fancy do but symbolize the scrupulous refinements of his sensitive conscience. Kindred, as he was, with the kindling spirit of that new morning of history in which he lived, he was yet filled with the sweetest virtues of the catholic past. He would not believe that the ideal graces of the Christian knight could pass away with the armor of the Crusades.

The pure, proud poet might have worn the motto of a noble Breton house, "I will not condescend." And the

---

\* *Westward Ho! The Voyages and Adventures of Sir Amyas Leigh, Knight, of Burrough, in the County of Devon, in the Reign of Her Most Glorious Majesty Queen Elizabeth*. Rendered into Modern English by CHARLES KINGSLEY, Author of "*Hypatia*," "*Alton Locke*," &c., &c. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1855. 12mo. pp. 588.

consciousness of every man whose experience has shown him that life can bring no calamity so dreadful as the degradation of the soul's ideal, applauds the stately words of Spenser when he says : —

“ Let no man blame me, if in discipline  
Of virtue and of civil uses' lore  
I do not form them to the common line  
Of present days, which are corrupted sore,  
But to the antique use which was of yore  
When good was only for itself desired.”

It is this fine quality of aspiring purity which gives to the poetry of Spenser its most undying charm. To read the *Fairy Queen* is to live in the highest company. The same subtile influence which makes a man carry himself more nobly in the presence of the pictures of Vandyke, finds its way to the heart as we commune with the

“ Courteous Calidore,  
Whose every act and word that he did say  
Was like enchantment, that, thro' both the eyes  
And both the eares, did steal the soul away.”

An accomplished editor of Spenser takes occasion to infer the comparative uselessness of the *Fairy Queen* as a moral influence, from the impossibility which exists for a modern man to model himself into a mediæval knight-errant. But this is a strange misapprehension, for the uses of an imaginative ideal are to be sought where we look for those of an inspired life, in the confirmation which it lends to our own independent aspirations, and in the light which it sheds upon our own relations with the actual world in which we live. Are the models of an Apostolic age of no service to any but missionaries? Has the life of a Hebrew prophet no moral value for any but the man who refuses to shave, and makes his home in a cavern?

There is and will always be a value beyond the value of many tracts in the portraiture of Spenser. They are a light in the world. For they paint with the glow of an untarnished trust, as Cervantes has painted with the shadows of a larger and a sadder experience, the trials of a lofty and generous ambition in a world of low and selfish aims. And never did Lord Bacon's

grand definition of the substance of true poetry find a brighter illustration than in the *Fairy Queen*, which indeed "serveth and conferreth to magnanimity, morality, and delectation."

Modern philanthropy may quarrel (if philanthropy can be allowed to quarrel) with Spenser's delight in battle and in the interchange of ringing blows; modern propriety may drop its green veil over some of Spenser's Ariostan picturings; but after all it is true of all worthy admiration in letters as in love, —

"What outward form and feature are  
It guesseth but in part,  
*But what within is good and fair*  
*It seeth with the heart."*

If the heart of the writer be sweet and sound, the life of the work cannot be other than inspiring and wholesome. And when we set about judging the *morale* of a work of art, we must test it as if we were dealing with a man, and handle it as we would ourselves be handled.

There is no limit to the injustice and the absurdity into which an opposite course must lead us. Here, for instance, in the small world of American letters, we have had, within a little time, one critic who is sure that Milton was almost a fetichist, because he loved and used the grand old personalities of the Hebrew faith; and another, who has set down Shakespeare as a sycophant, because he spoke respectfully of his sovereign. And really, if the incidental characteristics of a man's views and conduct are to weigh more with us than the essential traits of his temper and his spirit in an estimate of himself and his works, what shall become, not only of the world's greatest men, but of all of our humble selves who fill our little places in the passing scene?

We make these remarks here, because we know no living writer whom it is more necessary to approach in the true spirit of criticism than Mr. Kingsley. He is a man in conviction so emphatic, in passion so intense, and in purpose so earnest, that there is hardly a page of his writings that may not startle a thinking reader into differences of opinion or antagonism of sentiment.

A preacher, not merely by profession, but by constitution, his painting and his poetry preach. He seeks



firstly, and above all, to move men, and the main question to be settled with respect to him, therefore, is, *why* he seeks to move men, and *whither* he seeks to move them. That once settled, we are free to quarrel with his means.

What then is the *animus* of Mr. Kingsley's writings? Various are the forms which Mr. Kingsley's preaching has assumed, but the spirit which informs them all lies involved, we think, in the statement which we find in a little book of his, entitled "Loose Thoughts for Loose Thinkers," in which he does trenchant and tremendous justice upon some of the Transcendentalists, falsely so styled, of our own dear country. And the statement is this: that "Socrates is, as Augustine styled him, the philosopher of the Catholic faith." For what does this imply? That the highest truths of religion are convertible into common sense; that the warm natural emotions of the human heart, healed and made sound by faith, involve the solution of our metaphysical doubts, and the victory over our sensual temptations; that the man who, in whatever direction, throws himself out of his humane relations with his fellow-men, must thereby become a stumbling-block to his generation and a torment to himself.

It is by virtue of these convictions that Mr. Kingsley has been led to paint the disastrous realities of modern life like a socialist, and to treat of their remedies like a churchman. He finds in the cruelties of caste, in the selfishness of competition, in the meanness of Mammon-worship, so many falsifications of the relations which man should sustain to his fellow-man; and he looks for the cure of these evils to a practical revival of that religion of humility and brotherhood which he believes to be set before the people of England in the faith of the English Church. He would not have men go out of the way of their immediate opportunities into the vanities of proud and private speculation in search of consolation for themselves or the means of influence with their brethren.

That we are correct in this estimate of the main tenor of Mr. Kingsley's writings might easily be demonstrated at great length. But a few examples must serve us here.

Let the reader revive for a moment and reflect upon his recollections of Alton Locke. What was the burden of the wail which rang through the pages of that most effective work? Was it not complaint of the utter inadequacy of our present social system to develop and employ the best capacities of individual men? In the relations of the young Alton with his employers, with the family of his patron, and then with the world at large, this one lesson was reiterated, that the organization of society is equally unchristian and clumsy; that the influences of what we call the "struggle with the world" conspire to madden men into extravagance, to harden them into selfishness, or to stun them into indifference. Nor was the lesson less earnestly pressed, that the only spirit which can truly comfort and strengthen the individual man, and the only spirit to which we can look for the regeneration of society itself is the spirit of a religion at once submissive, energetic, patient, and practical. The burning criticisms of Alton Locke bear not more severely upon the surly egotisms of the pluralist and the capitalist than upon the frantic wilfulness of the unbeliever and the chartist; and while well-fed Tories have berated the Rector of Eversley over their port-wine and walnuts as a disorganizing radical, impassioned enthusiasts of the subversive school have denounced him as a clerical dreamer, who would turn the mighty stream of revolution into the narrow channel of the Jordan.

In the romance of *Yeast* the same ideas reappear. There we have high-born ladies dying of diseases engendered by the neglect of the habitations of the poor, men of fashion perishing miserably in the despair of a selfish and heartless career, intellectual reformers elevated into earnest evangelists by the discipline of calamity and the influence of the piety which makes a poor man strong to resist the degradations of his condition.

Once again, in *Hypatia* the same old foes come before us, wearing a new face, but to be defeated by the old weapons. In *Bishop Cyril* we see religion grow worldly, inflaming the misery of the world whose sorrows it was commissioned to relieve; in *Hypatia* we see the hopeless failure of aspirations too lone and haughty; in *Raphael*, the withering worthlessness of scornful speculation and luxurious doubt; in *Philammon*, the

blight of a mistaken and ascetic earnestness healed at last by the shower of burning tears and the sunlight of a merciful faith; in Synesius, a good, honest Christian heart, willing to love God in his creatures, and glad to serve him in the open ways. And now, once more, in this new romance of Amyas Leigh we find the indefatigable preacher enforcing his faith upon the living Englishmen of modern England, from the examples of the most heroic age of English history.

The key-note of this romance, as of all the others, is the supreme importance of doing the day's immediate duty in hearty sympathy with those among whom our lot is cast. This is a good, a clear, and a noble note. It strikes upon a sounding chord in the human heart. It quickens brave impulses within us, and manly aspirations. It scatters speculation, and strikes doubt dead. It may heed intolerance, but never indifference. It may make men terrible, but never contemptible.

The friends of an easy and showy virtue may find the romances of Mr. Kingsley, as Madame de Staël found the *Fairy Queen*, "the most tedious things that ever were written." The patrons of a cosmopolitan philanthropy may find them fierce and narrow. But consistent, vigorous, and impassioned they unquestionably are. There is nothing vague in Mr. Kingsley's aims, nothing weak in his purpose. And therefore we cannot but think his books to be essentially good books, books hostile to the loose and flaccid temper of the times, friendly to that "girding up of the loins" which is the first condition of a masculine piety and an efficient faith. They are in so far good romances, that they "serve and confer to magnanimity and to morality."

Take, for instance, this picture, from "*Amyas Leigh*," of the hero in his youth:—

"This young gentleman, Amyas Leigh, though come of as good blood as any in Devon, and having lived all his life in what we should even now call the very best society, and being (on account of the valor, courtesy, and truly noble qualities which he showed forth in his most eventful life) chosen by me as the hero and centre of this story, was not, saving for his good looks, by any means what would be called now-a-days an 'interesting' youth, still less a 'highly educated' one; for, with the exception of a little Latin, which had been driven into him by

repeated blows, as if it had been a nail, he knew no books whatsoever, save his Bible, his prayer-book, the old 'Mort d'Arthur' of Caxton's edition, which lay in the great bay window in the hall, and the translation of 'Las Casas' History of the West Indies,' which lay beside it, lately done into English under the title of 'The Cruelties of the Spaniards.' He devoutly believed in fairies, whom he called pixies; and held that they changed babies, and made the mushroom rings on the downs to dance in. When he had warts or burns, he went to the white witch at Northam to charm them away; he thought that the sun moved round the earth, and that the moon had some kindred with a Cheshire cheese. He held that the swallows slept all the winter at the bottom of the horse-pond; talked, like Raleigh, Grenville, and other low persons, with a broad Devonshire accent; and was in many other respects so very ignorant a youth, that any pert monitor in a national school might have had a hearty laugh at him. Nevertheless, this ignorant young savage, 'vacant of the glorious gains' of the nineteenth century, children's literature and science made easy, and, worst of all, of those improved views of English history now current among our railway essayists, which consist in believing all persons, male and female, before the year 1688, and nearly all after it, to have been either hypocrites or fools, had learnt certain things which he would hardly have been taught just now in any school in England; for his training had been that of the old Persians, 'to speak the truth, and to draw the bow,' both of which savage virtues he had acquired to perfection, as well as the equally savage ones of enduring pain cheerfully, and of believing it to be the finest thing in the world to be a gentleman; by which word he had been taught to understand the careful habit of causing needless pain to no human being, poor or rich, and of taking pride in giving up his own pleasure for the sake of those who were weaker than himself. Moreover, having been intrusted for the last year with the breaking of a colt, and the care of a cast of young hawks which his father had received from Lundy Isle, he had been profiting much by the means of those coarse and frivolous amusements, in perseverance, thoughtfulness, and the habit of keeping his temper; and though he had never had a single 'object lesson,' or been taught to 'use his intellectual powers,' he knew the names and ways of every bird, and fish, and fly, and could read, as cunningly as the oldest sailor, the meaning of every drift of cloud which crossed the heavens. Lastly, he had been for some time past, on account of his extraordinary size and strength, undisputed cock of the school, and the most terrible fighter among all Bideford boys; in which brutal habit he took much delight, and contrived, strange as it may seem, to extract from it good, not only for himself, but for others, doing



justice among his school-fellows with a heavy hand, and succoring the oppressed and afflicted ; so that he was the terror of all the sailor-lads, and the pride and stay of all the town's-boys and girls, and hardly considered that he had done his duty in his calling if he went home without beating a big lad for bullying a little one. For the rest, he never thought about thinking, or felt about feeling ; and had no ambition whatsoever beyond pleasing his father and mother, getting by honest means the maximum of ' red quarrenders ' and mazard cherries, and going to sea when he was big enough. Neither was he what would be now-a-days called by many a pious child ; for though he said his Creed and Lord's prayer night and morning, and went to the service at the church every forenoon, and read the day's Psalms with his mother every evening, and had learnt from her and from his father (as he proved well in after life), that it was infinitely noble to do right, and infinitely base to do wrong, yet (the age of children's religious books not having yet dawned on the world) he knew nothing more of theology, or of his own soul, than is contained in the Church Catechism. It is a question, however, on the whole, whether, though grossly ignorant (according to our modern notions) in science and religion, he was altogether untrained in manhood, virtue, and godliness ; and whether the barbaric narrowness of his information was not somewhat counterbalanced both in him and in the rest of his generation by the depth, and breadth, and healthiness of his education." — pp. 8, 9.

Can anybody be so superfluous as to suppose that the sympathy which every one must feel with the writer, in his admiration of the *fine* qualities here portrayed, must lead us to desire the abolition of our common schools, or even the serious mitigation of the scientific wisdom therein imparted ? And is it not good for us to be moved with a quick pleasure in these traits of simplicity, strength, and manliness ? \*

---

\* Nothing could have been more felicitously appropriate than Mr. Kingsley's dedication of "Amyas Leigh" to Bishop Selwyn of New Zealand, and Rajah Brooke of Borneo. Bishop Selwyn is such a missionary as Sydney Smith himself would have honored, — a noble and manly soldier of the cross, who carries civilization, liberality, and good sense with him wherever he goes. And various as have been the rumors concerning Rajah Brooke, we see not how any man who reads his letters and his journal can fail to recognize in him a character of the true heroic stamp, a man who makes his mark wherever he treads, and in whom the antique thirst of adventure is ennobled by a large benevolence and an unselfish prudence. It is but recently that we have seen a letter from Borneo, in which the condition of the Dyaks under the sway of the English Rajah is represented as more truly satisfactory than that of any people in the Archipelago. A few skulls are indeed to be seen still appended to the rafters of

Or go on a little further with the hero in his history. Follow him to his stout wrestles with danger far across the sea, to his facing of the Spaniard on the golden shores of the New World, to his perils in the tropic wilderness, and his brave bearing in the leaguer of the Fort del Oro on the Irish coast; go with him through his manifold sorrows and his stubborn sinfulness; try the *animus* of the whole tale by your final emotions, fair and candid reader, and we think you will agree with us that the lesson of the whole leaves you less in love with bigotry and Titanic wrath, than moved to manly thought and pregnant feeling.

Much fault has been found with Mr. Kingsley for the light in which he has portrayed the Catholic antagonists of Elizabethan England. He certainly has made his Jesuits very unlovely characters, and in his pictures of the Catholic Spaniards of the sixteenth century, he has painted them rather as they appeared to their Protestant foemen than as they really were. But to expect that he should have done otherwise is to misapprehend utterly the character and the purpose of his work. Great injustice has, doubtless, been done to the "Paynim giants" in the romances of chivalry, but a judicious reader can sympathize with the knights of Christendom without accepting their notions of the "Saracen dogs" to whom they were opposed. And if we will remember that, in reading such a book as *Amyas Leigh*, we are not reading a philosophical history, nor a "View of all Religions," but strictly a *romance*, there is little reason to fear our being inflamed thereby into a "No-Popery" fever.

If a man is so constituted that he cannot avoid surrendering up his common sense and his judgment into the hands of the preacher or the romancer who happens for a time to engage his attention, there is no safety for him either in reading romances or in listening to sermons. It enters into the very quality of a romance to idealize the bad qualities of the bad, as well as the good qualities of the good, and the comparisons which we have

---

the new houses, but they are mementos of the past; *no new ones* have been added since the accession of the Rajah to power, and the reformed Dyak of "Young Borneo" regards these trophies of his ancestors with a pure antiquarian interest, such as "Young England" might take in the armor of the conquest and the rusty swords of the civil wars.

seen instituted between the "Amyas Leigh" of Mr. Kingsley and the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott, to the disadvantage of the former as respects the question of historical accuracy, fall to the ground in view of the fact that the works of Sir Walter are *novels*, while the work of Mr. Kingsley is a *romance*.

We do not mean to push this point so far as to assert that Mr. Kingsley himself is not to a certain extent deceived by his own imaginations in this matter. For we are inclined to the opinion, not merely by the evidence internal in "Amyas Leigh" itself, but still more by our perusal of the author's article on "Sir Walter Raleigh" in the North British Review for April of this year, that Mr. Kingsley believes his typical pictures to be more consonant with historical reality than we can admit them to be.

But this does not affect the decision of the question, how far a romancer is bound to strict accuracy in his delineation of historical types. When those types are employed, as in the present instance, to enforce the legitimate objects of a hortatory romance, a writer cannot justly be required to show both sides of the shield. In this respect we have no fault to find with the artistic execution of Mr. Kingsley's romance.

But as the consideration of this matter introduces us to the third element of Lord Bacon's definition of poetic romance, we may go on to say, that, in regard of "delectation," the tale of "Amyas Leigh" seems to us to fail, partially through the imperfection, and indeed the inadequacy, of the plot.

The construction of the romance, we think, bears the marks of haste, and may perhaps be pronounced clumsy. The charms of Rose Salterne are not set forth so impressively as to justify the extravagant passions she excites, and on the force of which the main development of the story is made to hinge. Neither is there much ingenuity displayed in the weaving of that chain of relations by means of which the heroine of the secondary plot, Ayacanora, is introduced into the history. We must strenuously object also to the violation, not of conventional, but of intrinsic probabilities, by which Amyas Leigh is made to be so long, and we had almost said so brutally, insensible to the tender influences of his sweet

and noble mother, and of the artless and loving girl who finally becomes his wife. And the abundant strength and beauty with which the flight of the shattered Armada of Spain around the weary circle of the Northern seas is described, hardly reconcile us to the somewhat theatrical and even melodramatic way in which Amyas Leigh is led by the thirst of vengeance up to the catastrophe of his conversion by a flash of lightning. A simpler and more truly artistic construction of the plot would have enhanced the interest, and to the general reader would have facilitated the reading of this romance.

In beauties of detail no work of the author is more rich. Mr. Kingsley rarely constructs a character. But in the honest Jack Brimblecombe, that strange compound of imperfect literature and genuine feeling, of skin-deep valor and heart-sound faith, he has drawn a living man, less adequately developed indeed, but as fresh and original, as the inimitable Saunders Mackey of Alton Locke. The scene in which Jack, sore smitten by the fear of sharks, invades and conquers a boatful of Spaniards, is "of an excellent mirth." Nor is the character of the girl Ayacanora, though less original, without reality and sufficient sharpness of outline. And Mrs. Leigh, the sweet, sad, and stately mother of Amyas, is a fine conception worthily wrought out.

Mr. Kingsley's love of Nature, in all her moods, is simple, hearty, and passionate, and it reveals itself in the subdued and finished beauty of his landscapes. His delight in human strength and grace is truly Homeric, and communicates a singular zest to his hunting-scenes and his battle-pieces. What reader of his works will not easily recall such pictures as the headlong gallop after the hounds, which opens the strange romance of *Yeast*, or the ostrich hunt and cavalry skirmish to which the worthy Bishop Synesius introduced Raphael Abenezra in the wilderness of North Africa?

In certain departments of descriptive power, Mr. Kingsley is indeed without a superior. In perception of chiaroscuro, physical and moral, he is not excelled by the brilliant author of *Eothen*; his pictures are as subtly interfused with healthy sentiment as those of the lamented "*Currer Bell*," and Mr. Ruskin, in his best moments, has hardly a finer mastery over pictorial speech, while the



indefinable quality of the poet's eye belongs more truly to Mr. Kingsley than to any of these gifted writers. It is with no ordinary interest that we look forward to the publication of his promised volume of poems.

Who, but a poet, with his singing-robcs about him could have given us such a scene as this ?

"Three o'clock, upon a still, pure, bright, midsummer morning. A broad and yellow sheet of ribbed tide-sands, through which the shallow river wanders from one hill-foot to the other, whispering round dark knolls of rock, and under low tree-fringed cliffs, and banks of golden broom. A mile below, the long bridge and the white-walled town, all sleeping pearly in the soft haze, beneath a cloudless vault of blue. The white glare of dawn, which last night hung high in the northwest, has travelled now to the northeast, and above the wooded wall of the hills the sky is flushing with rose and amber.

"A long line of gulls goes wailing up inland ; the rooks from Annery come cawing and sporting round the corner at Land-cross, while high above them four or five herons flap solemnly along to find their breakfast on the shallows. The pheasants and partridges are clucking merrily in the long wet grass ; every copse and hedgerow rings with the voice of birds ; but the lark, who has been singing since midnight in the 'blank height of the dark,' suddenly hushes his carol and drops head-long among the corn, as a broad-winged buzzard swings from some wooded peak into the abyss of the valley, and hangs high-poised above the heavenward songster. The air is full of perfume ; sweet clover, new-mown hay, the fragrant breath of kine, the dainty scent of sea-weed wreaths and fresh wet sand."

— p. 250.

Where shall we look for a more exquisite and finished scene of rural English beauty, than this ?

"From the house, on three sides, the hill sloped steeply down, and the garden where Sir Richard and Amyas were walking gave a truly English prospect. At one turn they could catch, over the western walls, a glimpse of the blue ocean flecked with passing sails ; and at the next, spread far below them, range on range of fertile park, stately avenue, yellow autumn woodland, and purple heather moors, lapping over and over each other up the valley to the old British earthwork, which stood black and furze-grown on its conical peak ; and standing out against the sky on the highest bank of hill which closed the valley to the east, the lofty tower of Kilkhampston church, rich with the monuments and offerings of five centuries of Grenvilles. A yellow eastern haze hung soft over park, and wood, and moor ; the red

cattle lowed to each other as they stood brushing away the flies in the rivulet far below ; the colts in the horse-park close on their right whinnied as they played together, and their sires from the Queen's park, on the opposite hill, answered them in fuller though fainter voices. A rutting stag made the still woodland rattle with his hoarse thunder, and a rival far up the valley gave back a trumpet note of defiance, and was himself defied from heathery brows which quivered far away above, half seen through the veil of eastern mist. And close at home, upon the terrace before the house, amid romping spaniels and golden-haired children, sat Lady Grenville herself, the beautiful St. Leger of Annery, the central jewel of all that glorious place, and looked down at her noble children, and then up at her more noble husband, and round at that broad paradise of the west, till life seemed too full of happiness, and heaven of light." — pp. 120, 121.

And is not this a sea-piece worthy of Stanfield or Turner ?

"The short light of the winter day is fading fast. Behind him is the leaping line of billows lashed into mists by the tempest. Beside him green, foam-fringed columns are rushing up the black rocks, and falling again in a thousand cataracts of snow. Before him is the deep and sheltered bay : but it is not far up the bay that he and his can see ; for some four miles out at sea begins a sloping roof of thick gray cloud, which stretches over their heads and up and far away inland, cutting the cliffs off at mid-height, hiding all the Kerry mountains, and darkening the hollows of the distant firths into the blackness of night. And underneath that awful roof of whirling mist the storm is howling inland ever, sweeping before it the great foam-sponges, and the gray salt spray, till all the land is hazy, dim, and dun." — pp. 174, 175.

And this ?

"Outside, the southwest wind blew fresh and strong, and the moonlight danced upon a thousand crests of foam ; but within the black jagged point which sheltered the town, the sea did but heave, in long oily swells of rolling silver, onward into the black shadow of the hills, within which the town and pier lay invisible, save where a twinkling light gave token of some lonely fisher's wife, watching the weary night through for the boat which would return with dawn. Here and there upon the sea, a black speck marked a herring-boat, drifting with its line of nets ; and right off the mouth of the glen, Amyas saw, with a beating heart, a large two-masted vessel lying-to, — that must be the 'Portugal !' Eagerly he looked up the glen, and listened ; but

he heard nothing but the sweeping of the wind across the downs five hundred feet above, and the sough of the waterfall upon the rocks below ; he saw nothing but the vast black sheets of oak-wood sloping up to the narrow blue sky above, and the broad bright hunter's moon, and the woodcocks, which, chuckling to each other, hawked to and fro, like swallows, between the tree-tops and the sky." — pp. 99, 100.

We forbear to dwell on the terrible strength with which the horrors of Mr. Oxenham's fatal march over the mountains of the Isthmus are described. Of their more terrible truth who can doubt, that has shuddered and rejoiced over the sufferings and the heroism of our own countrymen, who, in our day, have trod the same pathway of death, and have given to the annals of American renown the brave names of Truxton and of Strain?

We prefer to set before our readers these gorgeous canvases, glowing with the luxuriant hues of tropical nature : —

"All day long a careful watch was kept among the branches of the mighty ceiba-tree. And what a tree that was! The hugest English oak would have seemed a stunted bush beside it. Borne up on roots, or rather walls, of twisted board, some twelve feet high, between which the whole crew, their ammunitions and provisions, were housed roomily, rose the enormous trunk, full forty feet in girth, towering like some tall lighthouse, smooth for a hundred feet, then crowned with boughs, each of which was a stately tree, whose topmost twigs were full two hundred and fifty feet from the ground. And yet it was easy for the sailors to ascend ; so many natural ropes had kind Nature lowered for their use, in the smooth lianes which hung to the very earth, often without a knot or leaf. Once in the tree, you were within a new world, suspended between heaven and earth, and, as Cary said, no wonder if, like Jack when he climbed the magic bean-stalk, you had found a castle, a giant, and a few acres of well-stocked park, packed away somewhere amid that labyrinth of timber. Flower-gardens at least were there in plenty ; for every limb was covered with pendent cactuses, gorgeous orchises, and wild pines ; and while one half the tree was clothed in rich foliage, the other half, utterly leafless, bore on every twig brilliant yellow flowers, around which humming-birds whirled all day long. Parrots peeped in and out of every cranny, while, within the airy woodland, brilliant lizards basked like living gems upon the bark, gaudy finches flitted and chirruped, butterflies of every

size and color hovered over the topmost twigs, innumerable insects hummed from morn till eve; and when the sun went down, tree-toads came out to snore and croak till dawn. There was more life round that one tree than in a whole square mile of English soil."—pp. 381, 382.

"On the further side of a little lawn, the stream leaped through a chasm beneath overarching vines, sprinkling eternal freshness upon all around, and then sank foaming into a clear rock-basin, a bath for Dian's self. On its further side, the crag rose some twenty feet in height, bank upon bank of feathered ferns and cushioned moss, over the rich green beds of which drooped a thousand orchids, scarlet, white, and orange, and made the still pool gorgeous with the reflection of their gorgeousness. At its more quiet outfall, it was half hidden in huge fantastic leaves and tall flowering stems; but near the waterfall the grassy bank sloped down toward the stream, and there on palm-leaves strewed upon the turf, beneath the shadow of the crags, lay the two men whom Amyas sought, and whom, now he had found them, had hardly heart to wake from their delicious dream.

"For what a nest it was which they had found! The air was heavy with the scent of flowers, and quivering with the murmur of the stream, the humming of the colibris and insects, the cheerful song of birds, the gentle cooing of a hundred doves; while now and then, from far away, the musical wail of the sloth, or the deep toll of the bell-bird, came softly to the ear. What was not there which eye or ear could need? And what which palate could need either? For on the rock above, some strange tree, leaning forward, dropped every now and then a luscious apple upon the grass below, and huge wild plantains bent beneath their load of fruit.

"There, on the stream-bank, lay the two renegades from civilized life. They had cast away their clothes, and painted themselves like the Indians, with arnotto and indigo. One lay lazily picking up the fruit which fell close to his side; the other sat, his back against a cushion of soft moss, his hands folded languidly upon his lap, giving himself up to the soft influence of the narcotic cocoa-juice, with half-shut dreamy eyes fixed on the everlasting sparkle of the waterfall,—

'While beauty, born of murmuring sound,  
Did pass into his face.'

"Somewhat apart crouched their two dusky brides, crowned with fragrant flowers, but working busily, like true women, for the lords whom they delighted to honor. One sat plaiting palm-fibres into a basket; the other was boring the stem of a huge



milk-tree, which rose like some mighty column on the right hand of the lawn, its broad canopy of leaves unseen through the dense underwood of laurel and bamboo, and betokened only by the rustle far aloft, and by the mellow shade in which it bathed the whole delicious scene."—pp. 423, 424.

Extracts of this attractive nature we might largely multiply. But the admirable abundance of such gems itself forbids us to go on. It is enough if we have satisfied our readers that, after all allowances and deductions made, the tale of "Amyas Leigh" possesses, in no ordinary degree, the great elements of a fine and a worthy romance.

We hail it as a strong and a suggestive work. We shall be glad, indeed, if the author shall attain with advancing years a grander sweep of vision, and shall train his fertile genius to the production of riper, calmer, greater works, more rightly balanced, more deftly trimmed for the voyage of immortality. But that which he has already done has made for him a power and a presence among men, a living influence in which the purest may rejoice, and from which the manliest may take new strength and health.

W. H. H.

---

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1855. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 478, 564.

ABOUT twenty-five years ago Dr. Brewster published a life of Sir Isaac Newton in the "Family Library" series, using such confessedly scanty materials for the work as he then had at his command. That volume was especially deficient as regards such details as the popular class of readers would desire most to have presented to them. It revealed to us very little concerning the life and character of the man, and could hardly be pronounced successful in its evidently feeble effort to convey an intelligible idea of the principles and the substance of his philosophical discoveries. The splendid work now before us will therefore

find all the more welcome a reception, because amid all its other attractions it is most complete and satisfactory where its predecessor was most defective. The author has had the free use of all the manuscript papers preserved in the family of the Earl of Portsmouth, and has availed himself of all the other sources of information which the most diligent search could open to him. The results of his labors are given to us in these fair volumes, which constitute an adequate memorial of one of the noblest men, as well as of one of the profoundest intellects, of our human race. The perusal of them has afforded us an intense pleasure, and has awakened in us feelings which reach to the deepest places of our being.

A sufficiently full narrative of the youth, the domestic relations, and the early education of Newton prepares us to follow his career, which, while it was made illustrious beyond the usual splendors of fame by the most signal achievements of pure intellect in the abstrusest scientific pursuits, was also most attractive in the loveliness of piety and virtue. His biographer has shown an admirable appreciation of the true glory of Newton's character in his candid dealing with the only infirmities which it manifested amid the jealous rivalries and the petty annoyances which philosophy, no less than politics or theology, offers to try the spirits of men. We have no misgiving as to the perfect candor with which the acrimonious issues opened between Newton and Leibnitz, Bernoulli and Flamsteed, are dealt with by Sir David Brewster. He admits enough of sensitiveness, irritability, and jealousy on the part of Newton to satisfy all who are not the one-sided partisans of those three philosophers, and at the same time he clears up wholly those unpleasant impressions which the publication of Baily's *Life of Flamsteed* had naturally created as to the perfect uprightness of the author of the *Principia*. As these controversies related only to some of the incidental points in Newton's scientific discoveries, and did not reach to the grand and unchallenged eminences on which he was seated beyond all the daring pride of his rivals, they could at the worst be used merely to dim his moral renown without abating from the glory of his genius. His biographer has so cleared up everything that had a dubious aspect in these matters, as to leave us the rare satisfaction of offering our homage of mind and heart to the subject of his pages.

In attempting to give to readers at all qualified to appreciate it an intelligible view of the real merits of Newton as the most eminent of all natural philosophers, Sir David Brewster had a work of great difficulty. Of course only those who can understand the optical and the astronomical discoveries of Newton, and

can peruse his own pages by the aid of ideas answering to the almost cabalistic lore before their eyes, can expect to appreciate his genius. Minds thus qualified are very rare. Locke, a philosopher in a different field, and the famous Dr. Bentley, a prince among scholars, both of them friends of Newton, felt impelled by their pride of mind, by their personal esteem, and by all the natural impulses which could act upon eminent men living in the age of signal discoveries, to apply themselves to the task of mastering the results set before them on the printed page. But those results can do but little more than amaze and bewilder, except they are reached by the processes from which they are developed. Those processes neither Locke nor Bentley could pursue, though they both had the especial help of Newton in answer to their earnest request. Sir David Brewster gives us the list of "books necessary to be read before studying the *Principia*" prepared for Bentley by Newton, and the much longer list drawn up for the same scholar by John Craig, an eminent mathematician. But we apprehend that the keen old critic found his task very unlike that of dealing with the Epistles of Phalaris. Our author gives us the most lucid pages which we have ever read in any attempted exposition of Newton's pursuits. The sketch presented in these volumes of the astronomical discoveries of Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo, is graphic and interesting, and level to the comprehension of general readers. But Newton leads us beyond our depth. Nor are we greatly surprised at a most downright contradiction of statement into which our author is betrayed within the space of ten pages of his work. After speaking of some contemporaneous opposition which the philosophy of Newton encountered on its first publication, and allowing some few exceptional instances in which its principles were accepted on the Continent, Sir David pens this sentence: "But notwithstanding these and some other examples that might be quoted, we must admit the truth of the remark of Voltaire, that, though Newton survived the publication of the *Principia* more than forty years, yet at the time of his death he had not above twenty followers in England." (Vol. I. p. 332.) Starting from this admission, Sir David, in proceeding to trace the progress of the Newtonian philosophy in England, quotes Professor Playfair's statement, that the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh were the first in Britain where it was adopted. Though the author's Scotch prepossessions might dispose him to favor this statement, his candor compels him to question it. He goes on to show that the new philosophy was at once introduced into England, and to specify its agencies and triumphs, till, in seeming oblivion of the sentence just quoted, he says: "From the

time of the publication of the *Principia*, its mathematical doctrines formed a regular part of academical education, and before twenty years had elapsed its physical truths were communicated to the public in popular lectures, illustrated by experiments, and accommodated to the capacities of those who were not versed in mathematical knowledge. The Cartesian system, though it may have lingered for a while in the recesses of our Universities, was soon overturned; and long before his death Newton enjoyed the high satisfaction of seeing his philosophy triumphant in his native land." (p. 342.) This is certainly a very interesting point, and we should be glad to receive instruction on it from Dr. Brewster; but as he both denies and affirms the same thing, he leaves us without the desired information.

Our readers may naturally expect us to acquaint them how the author deals with the question of Newton's religious opinions. We answer, that with evident reluctance, and coupled with the unnecessary expression of his own adhesion to Trinitarianism, Dr. Brewster frankly admits that Newton was a heretic of the sort which we regard as truly Christian in belief. Newton did not believe that Jesus Christ was God. Able as he was to cope with problems which would overset the brains of most theologians, he could not accept the mathematical puzzle of a Trinity in Unity. When Dr. Brewster published his first *Life of Newton*, he says he had not sufficient proof to convict his subject of heresy, as he conformed outwardly to the Church of England, and suppressed his paper on two disputed texts most urged in support of the Trinity. Further research has forced upon his biographer the evidence that Newton, like Milton and Locke, rejected the Athanasian absurdity which has sought for acceptance under the title of a *mystery*. It is melancholy, however, to notice with what a sheepish and timid spirit the biographer allows the truth on this point to transpire. He suggests to us that Newton, with other men in office, had good reason in an existing Parliamentary enactment for practising concealment of religious opinion. We do not believe that this motive operated, if it did at all, half as powerfully as did the prevailing superstition and bigotry of men's minds. When Dr. Brewster published his first *Life of Newton*, Dr. Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, addressed to him a letter accompanying a paper in defence of the Trinity. In this letter the Bishop wrote that his piece was "*occasioned by the perusal of your very interesting Life of Sir Isaac Newton, which I read with great pleasure till I came to the statement of the contents of Sir Isaac's Dissertation on 1 John v. 7; and 1 Timothy iii. 16. I thought the restatement of his opinions on these subjects injurious to his memory, as he had expressly and anxiously sup-*



pressed them." The Bishop charged the writer with omitting to notice this suppression. Dr. Brewster replied by letter, referring the Bishop to page 274 of his work, in which he had not only mentioned the fact of the suppression, but had printed in full Newton's letter to Locke which enjoined the suppression. Mark now the Bishop's answer: "I am still more sorry that I should have overlooked, or *rather not have seen*, the account in your work to which your letter directs me, and which I have since read, of the suppresssion of the dissertation. *The pages of your work (281-284) containing the statement of Sir Isaac Newton's opinions and paraphrase, were shown to me by a friend*, and as they contained no allusion to the suppression of the dissertation, I was led to suppose that you had altogether omitted to notice it." Was not this a humiliating exposure of himself to be made by a Bishop of the Church of Christ! To convict himself of downright falsehood while attempting to hunt down the heresy of such a man as Newton! The Bishop had perused the Life with great pleasure *till he came to* something on pages 281-284, and yet, on being challenged for *overlooking* something on p. 274, he was forced to confess that all he knew of the book was *on three pages shown to him by a friend!* One would prefer to take his chance with Newton, to adopting an orthodoxy which could consist with such shameless effrontery in falsehood. One of the Bishops of the Church describes Newton as "knowing more of the Scriptures than them all," and another Bishop said he had "the whitest soul" he ever knew. We are safe in affirming that three of the holiest, wisest, and most conscientious men that have lived in England were Milton, Locke, and Newton. In spite of Parliamentary edicts against heresy, these men, who had a knowledge of the Scriptures far exceeding that even of a majority of the Bishops of the realm, have succeeded in leaving to the world the evidence that they held the Unitarian doctrine. Such a fact as this must have its effect, perhaps all the deeper and more decisive on account of the slow methods by which it is developed.

---

*The Note-Book of an English Opium-Eater.* By THOMAS DE QUINCEY, Author of "Confessions of an English Opium-Eater," etc., etc. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1855. 12mo. pp. 294.

It should seem as though Mr. De Quincey's intellectual treasury is inexhaustible. Here we have the eighteenth or the nineteenth volume of selections from his miscellaneous writings; and yet it exhibits scarcely a trace of inferiority to the best of the

previous volumes. Certainly, in the amazing fertility of his mind, in the breadth and exactness of his learning, in the flexibility and fastidious elegance of his style, and in vigor as a thinker, he is surpassed by few writers of this century. With each new volume of his miscellanies we are introduced to some new phasis of his intellectual character, or the impression produced by some previous volume is strengthened. Taken altogether, he must be placed in the first rank of English prose-writers. Still it may be doubted whether any one ever reads his writings without a certain feeling of dissatisfaction, — without a feeling that the author is greater than his work, that he is, or might have been, capable of far greater things than he has accomplished. Whatever he has done has been fragmentary. His writings are the records of promises unfulfilled, of plans left incomplete, of works projected only to be thrown aside. And if we admit that his opium-eating has given added brilliancy to his style, and sometimes clarified his imagination, it is not less true that there are not a few pages in his writings over which a thick cloud lingers; and probably to this habit of opium-eating we may refer the existence of so many unfinished designs. It is because De Quincey's rank is deservedly so high, that defects which would be disregarded in a writer of inferior powers are so sensibly felt in reading the works of this profound and comprehensive scholar. His powers have been dissipated in fragmentary productions of astonishing brilliancy and force, but still mere fragments; and his name must be added to the splendid but melancholy list of those who have left in dying no adequate memorial of their intellectual wealth.

The volume before us comprises thirteen papers of a miscellaneous character, but all strongly marked by De Quincey's peculiarities of thought and style. Of these papers the most striking is a brilliant and lawless review of Schlosser's *Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, — an article which no one except De Quincey could have written, and such as he could have written only under particular circumstances. There are also a scholarly essay on the *Antigone* of Sophocles as represented on the Edinburgh stage; two brief and thoughtful essays on the *True Relations of the Bible to merely Human Science*, and on *Superficial Knowledge*, which, in a few words, penetrate directly to the heart of the subject; some keen criticism of Dryden's *Hexastich*, and Pope's *Retort upon Addison*; two characteristic articles on *Milton vs. Southey* and *Landor*, and on *Falsification of English History*; and several other noticeable papers on kindred topics.

*Full Proof of the Ministry. A Sequel to the Boy who was trained up to be a Clergyman.* By JOHN N. NORTON, A. M., Rector of Ascension Church, Frankfort, Ky. New York: Redfield. 12mo. pp. 245.

It is hard to find fault with a story of which the temper is so amiable, and the style so pure, as that of this narrative of the patient labors and the early death of a simple-hearted Episcopal missionary. The character of the Rev. Edward Mason is, in the main, what the character of a good minister ought to be. We have no doubt that such a man would be sure, in any denomination, to succeed in building up a church. Yet apart from his personal character, we cannot see in this book any good reason why the particular form of religion which he brought should have made so many proselytes. The logic of the story is not sound, and not in place, when one considers that the scene of it is laid in the Western valley, where minds do not readily give themselves up to the fascination of a mere decent ritual. We notice beneath the pleasant charity of this tale the same undertone of confident assumption which characterizes almost always the tracts of "the Church." We are early informed that the existence of various religious *denominations*, with one or other of which most of the influential people had already united themselves, "offered in Rockford" no insurmountable obstacle in the way of the Church. It might hinder her growth for a season, and try the faith and patience of her ministers, but nothing can withstand the steady advance of God's universal kingdom. The beginning may be small, but the final triumph is certain. Zion will come forth with songs of rejoicing, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners"! So, too, we learn (on p. 36) that when Miss Claxton's father, a popular Methodist preacher, died, "the young lady got hold of Cooke on Episcopacy, and a life of Wesley, which put her upon the right track, and though bitterly opposed, I might almost say *persecuted* by her friends, she persisted in joining the Church."

In another place (p. 41), Mr. Mason, visiting in a Free-will Baptist family, incidentally suggests that, if they would trace back their family history for a few generations, they would find that their great-grandfathers and mothers "all worshipped God according to the forms of the prayer-book; for then the unhappy divisions which now disturb the Christian world did not exist." In another visit (p. 72) he is moved playfully to ask how many churches we read of in the Bible, and in what chapter and verse "Brother Bilger's church is mentioned." On page 171, Mr. Mason visits rheumatic Mrs. Syle, a Baptist, comforts her with portions of the prayer-book, and is impressed with her answer to

his statement concerning its *unadulterated* transmission of "the pure and ancient faith." She paused a moment, and then remarked, "*I think* that, after all, must be the true Church, because it never changes."

We might give several more examples of the same kind, and comment upon the reasons which the Rev. Mr. Mason gives for declining to unite in a Sabbath-school celebration with other "denominations," but these are enough to show that the author is a sound Churchman. We are surprised, however, in a story which does not apparently aim to be satirical, to see the unworthy and stale artifice of designating the characters of preachers by ludicrous significant names. The predecessor of Mr. Mason, a liberal Episcopalian, who of course *failed*, is styled "the Rev. Moses Latitude." The Methodist revival preacher rejoices in the high-sounding name of "Rev. Euphonious Brown." The Freewill Baptist's name is "Rev. Obadiah Bilger." The free and easy "Low Church" brother, who spits tobacco, gives out five verses to the hymn, and berates Puseyism, is "Rev. Dexter Doolittle." We may complain, too, that the peculiarities of other sects are caricatured. Mr. Mason rebukes his friend Mr. Doolittle for going to a Baptist meeting, where he saw "four boys dipped, the oldest of them ten." Yet Mr. Mason is a great stickler for the rubric of his own sect; a Baptist convert must be baptized over again, and the congregation must go two long years without a communion service, because their pastor has not taken priests' orders, or been touched by the anointed hands of a real bishop.

It comes out all right in the end. Poetical justice is done. The "Church" triumphs. A rich merchant comes home from India, and builds at his own expense an elegant edifice, architecturally correct, the parish adding a parsonage. The Methodist minister is converted and is licensed as a lay reader, and it does "one's soul good to hear Mr. Greenfield's [quondam Methodist] responses in the church on Sundays." His congregation follow him back into the "old paths." Even "Brother Bilger" is softened. And, finally, when everything has proved successful with Zion, the meek, inoffensive pastor, who had made such signal proof of his ministry, dies, and is honored by a marble slab at the right hand of the altar, and a few sentences of vague rhetoric from the "Bishop of Kentucky."



*A History of the Christian Church.* By DR. CHARLES HASE, Professor of Theology in the University of Jena. Translated from the Seventh and much improved German Edition, by CHARLES E. BLUMENTHAL, Professor of Hebrew and of Modern Languages in Dickinson College, and CONWAY P. WING, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 8vo. pp. 720.

A HISTORY of the Christian Church is still to be written. We have the materials, and many noble attempts have been made towards the construction of the work, but as yet the master-builder has not appeared. It would be ungrateful indeed to complain of what so learned a scholar and so indefatigable a writer as Neander did not do, or to deny the great merits of his volumes, but those who are best persuaded of his excellent deserts in this way will not claim for him the skill to mould his vast amount of material into a well-proportioned form, or to set forth his narrative with those various lights that cheer the reader along. The first three volumes of Milman were exceedingly agreeable reading, but his Latin Christianity makes large demands upon the grammatical ingenuity of the student, and, as we have already been obliged to say in our notice of the work, seems to have been wearily finished. Dr. Hase does not claim to have supplied this deficiency, but he has done much in aid of one who should have the genius, both as an investigator and writer, to clothe the skeleton which he has given us with flesh, and make the living tide flow through the arteries, and withal has himself provided a volume, which for a compound is very fresh and sprightly. Any abstract that attempts to give the events of eighteen hundred years within some eight hundred octavo pages must touch very lightly upon each point, and often remind one of a chronological table, and our author's book will be read rather for instruction than for entertainment; but it is as little heavy as was possible in the circumstances, and, so far as our examination has extended, is entirely reliable. Dr. Hase can hardly supersede Gieseler, with his very full foot-notes and vouchers of all sorts, and yet for a book to lie upon the table and to be taken up when the student desires to refresh his memory and gain added direction in his search, its equal in this department cannot be found. In its most modern portions, and as a history of sects, it must secure a reading from a large multitude. The enterprise of translators and of publishers that has given so valuable a book to American students has been well bestowed, and the result is in every way satisfactory.

*History of Turkey.* By A. DE LAMARTINE, Author of "The Girondists," "Travels in the Holy Land," &c. Translated from the French. In Three Volumes. Vol. I. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 403.

It is a history of Turkey and more, for, besides a very full Preface upon the Eastern Question, we have quite an elaborate account of the rise and progress of Islamism, the wonderful story of Mahomet, which, as it seems to us, has never been told so well as in this volume. We have here only a third portion of the whole work, and the narrative is brought down no farther than to the death of Mahomet I. called the Generous, one of the noblest of the Ottoman Sultans. The book is exceedingly opportune, and cannot fail to interest a large circle of readers. The life of the famous prophet, seen in the light which modern Oriental research has earned for us, is a most curious psychological problem, and can no longer be disposed of with the single word "imposition." The story of the progress of the Mussulmans, of the first appearance of the Turks, dating from the time when Khotaibah, lieutenant of the reigning Khalif, established Islamism in Turkestan, of the victories of Amurath and the rest, of the appearance of Timeur the Tartar upon the stage, and of the sad decline of the Byzantine Empire, would of itself fasten the attention of the reader like the most highly wrought romance; and when such marvels are set forth by a writer so brilliant as Lamartine, our interest scarcely flags for a moment, unless perhaps we grow a little weary of the very brilliancy, and long for some prose, as one who had been fed for days upon confectionary might long for a little dry bread. For we will not deny that Lamartine is too rhetorical, too *French*, to please us altogether, and we never feel quite safe with a writer who will not in any circumstances be dull. Wondrous events are constantly coming into the light of the world, and yet some events are not wondrous, and if they are to be narrated at all, very plain words will suffice. We observe that the translator, in a note to the Preface, is quite severe upon what he calls "the hubbub of antitheses" into which Lamartine has been misled in comparing the civilizations of the East and the West. He himself has not always succeeded in giving us English for the French of his author, though these failures are only the few exceptions to a general felicity. Let any one who knows what poor Turkey is now, and how hopeless it seems to attempt her renovation, read this famous story of her youth, and he will realize that nations have their term of natural life as well as individuals, and that, like individuals, they can aspire to immortality only as the divine element which Christ brought into the world gets possession of them.

*The Life of WILLIAM H. SEWARD, with Selections from his Works.* Edited by GEORGE E. BAKER. New York: Redfield. 1855. 12mo. pp. 404.

FROM the portrait over against the title-page, the distinguished Senator from New York looks out benignantly upon this story of his laborious and successful life. It must be an exceedingly delicate task to write the biography of a living man, and a candidate for a Presidential nomination,—to “take the stump” for him, as it were; but we are inclined to regard this attempt as very successful. Mr. Seward is an exception to the general statement, that the ablest minds of our country hold themselves aloof from politics, and allow small men to have their way. If he is true to himself and to his antecedents, he may do much to illumine the dark future which is before us. This brief memoir and the accompanying selections are well fitted to secure for an eloquent and right-minded man even a more extended reputation than he now enjoys.

---

*Kenneth; or, The Rear Guard of the Grand Army.* By the Author of “The Heir of Redclyffe,” “Heartsease,” “Castle-Building,” etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 320.

THE name of the writer does not yet appear upon the title-page, but we believe that our indebtedness to a lady for the very excellent novels enumerated above is past doubt. *Kenneth*, as the remainder of the title might suggest, is rather too full of horrors to be very pleasant reading, and we cannot but think that such a man as Colonel Lindesay could hardly have been left to marry such a woman as Céleste de Rocheguyon, beautiful as she is affirmed to have been, though indeed there is no knowing what men will do in this way. Still the book is conceived in an excellent spirit, and wrought out in many passages with considerable power. It is, in a good sense, a religious novel; the piety is not paraded. Its vivid pictures of the suffering that attended the disastrous retreat of Napoleon from Moscow ought to have a healthy influence in cooling martial ardor, though, strange to say, we think our author is not entirely free from it herself. On the whole, *Kenneth* may be read not without satisfaction and profit; but in comparison with the other productions from the same hand, an inferior position must be assigned to it.

*Discourses* by W. H. FURNESS. Philadelphia : G. Collins. Boston : Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 308.

THE thirteen Discourses in this volume present yet another illustration of the truth so often and so strikingly brought to our notice, that the common themes of Christian instruction, however familiar or hackneyed in some of their relations, may be made to glow with fresh beauty and power through the thought and the pen of an earnest Christian preacher. Dr. Furness has studied those themes with all the fidelity and love which it is their highest office to quicken in the heart of a believer. He seems to be penetrated by the persuasive and refining influence of their most spiritual views of life, and love, and duty, and trial, and faith. If we exclude from our estimate some few writers of sermons whose originality consists in eccentricity, and those who aim after conceit, or pedantry, or extravagances in language, we may truly say that none of the many volumes of sermons on our shelves offer us on their pages so much of that kind of interest and pleasure which is found in the development of unexpected trains of glowing thought, as does the volume before us. Though there is such a diversity of gifts among preachers, there prevails among them considerable sameness of phrase. We might safely agree to find the same or very similar combinations of words, and the same or very similar forms of expression, in the sermons of some dozen ordinary divines, even of different communions ; for pulpit formularies are well-nigh unavoidable by men of ordinary culture, and those who try hardest to avoid them will generally fall upon something not so good as they are. Dr. Furness's originality is that of native genius, cultivated by independent thought, directed by deep sincerity of feeling, and exercised for purposes which strong conviction and generous sentiment present to him, as being eminently those which demand the whole devotion of a Christian minister. These qualities will make any man original in his way of dealing with the inexhaustible themes of Christian doctrine when brought to bear upon human life ; but the golden charms of well-chosen speech, and the wealth of a refined fancy, and the dignity of tone which never falls below the grandeur of the loftiest themes, are rarely found in such a combination as impresses us in some of these Discourses. Dr. Furness has evidently possessed and indulged a strong predilection for writers of the sentimental school, both in prose and poetry, but he has caught none of their "babyisms" or puerilities. His manliness and strength of mind have saved him from the effeminate exaggeration of trifles, as well as from the belittling treatment of solemnities. His tone is one of deep earnestness, and his subjects are those which, while they



are appropriate to the pulpit, are also the most vital of the bonds by which the pulpit can still attach itself to the sympathies of men pressed upon by all the solicitations and distractions of the world.

We shall attempt no analysis of the contents of these Discourses, but content ourselves with inviting to them a large circle of readers, under the assurance that they will find here the richest nutriment of spiritual life. The fact that the preacher has been censured in some quarters for the earnestness of his protests against slavery, and its consequent corruption of our social and political life, will sufficiently account for the frequent references to that subject in this volume. If a man is challenged for such utterances as we find here, one must infer that the utterances need to be reiterated till they cease to be offensive.

---

*Beginning and Growth of the Christian Life; or, The Sunday School Teacher.* "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples." Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co., for the Sunday School Society. 1855. 12mo. pp. 190.

THIS volume is the first contribution of the Sunday School Society to our religious literature. It is a beginning wholly in the true spirit and the right direction,—the very manual which the pastors of our churches continually need to put into the hands of Sunday teachers. We hope that no one will pass it by as probably the thousandth reiteration of commonplaces about the value of Sunday schools, and the importance of the lessons which they are charged to convey. This book is nothing of the sort; but a very wise and earnest exhibition of the true aims and methods of one of our most valuable and yet most abused institutions, by one who has the ability and the courage to meet the facts of the case, and abstain from all inanities and smooth preaching. The grand idea of the writer is this,—that those who are not Christians themselves cannot make others Christians; and whilst questions of method and the details of instruction are by no means overlooked or carelessly treated, they are naturally subordinated to the enforcement and illustration of the inward and spiritual necessity in the case. We are satisfied that no one acquainted with the state of Sunday schools, with their serious deficiencies as well as with the little which they have accomplished, will hesitate to say that, if they are to be sustained any longer, it must be by teachers such as this book would aid in forming. Until some measure of this success can be reached, we should decidedly prefer the old method of catechismal in-

struction by the pastor, over the clumsy, creaking, and not seldom harmful machine of a merely formal Sunday school, — a weariness, and worse, both to teachers and scholars. We fear that our churches can hardly supply the material which this writer demands for the service; but if this is so, it is all the more necessary that the demand should be pressed, the poverty exposed, and some earnest efforts made to change the name of life into the reality. If the vital tide is ebbing, we cannot afford to be ignorant of it. We earnestly commend the book to pastors, teachers, and *parents*. The Sunday School Society deserves the thanks, not only of the friends of their cause, but of all who would see the Gospel established in the affections and lives of men, for a work so thoroughly evangelical in doctrine and spirit, and so attractive in style, as "The Sunday School Teacher." Its errand must be a blessed one.

---

*Art Hints. Architecture, Sculpture, and Painting.* By JAMES JACKSON JARVES, Author of "History of the Sandwich Islands," "Parisian Sights and French Principles," Member of the American Oriental Society, etc., etc. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1855. 12mo. pp. 398.

MR. JARVES is already favorably known to the readers of good books, and, as we judge, his excellent reputation will be increased by this fresh contribution to our literature. Amongst the almost numberless volumes which the legion of travellers has given us, we can recall none more readable or generally attractive than the "Parisian Sights and French Principles"; but the work before us is conceived in a higher spirit, and proposes a far more elevated aim. It is a noble sermon on Art, in which the preacher reaches the twentieth head, and even closes with an Appendix instead of the old "improvement," and yet escapes that quality of dulness which ill-natured or restless persons have persisted in attributing to this form of composition. The book is devoted to setting forth, by fitting and pleasant illustrations quite as much as by arguments, the high function of Art in the culture of humanity, — that only wise culture which recognizes our spiritual nature and immortal destiny. This object is earnestly pursued through every page, without the least element of *dilettantism*. The use of Art is clearly distinguished from its abuse, and Beauty is shown to be the natural ally and handmaid of true religion and civilization; not, as some, misled by too many unhappy instances, believe, the precursor and the author of individual and national decline. Such a discussion could never be out of season, but here and now it is specially timely.

In this matter, here in America, the world is all before us, and we have reached a crisis in our progress when it is to be settled whether a devotion to Art shall help or hinder us; whether our love of the beautiful shall be perverted and degraded into mere luxuriousness, or become a sweet persuasive to all righteousness; whether we shall expend our rapidly increasing wealth upon architectural monstrosities, upholstery, and incentives to passion, or upon those fair and noble structures and those chaste ornaments which at once express and foster the better spirit in man. According to Mr. Jarves, and the reasonableness of his opinion will commend itself at once to every one, we are in a far better condition to profit by the wonders of Art than our European brethren who are in possession of them. Bigotry and despotism, the priest and the tyrant, have not yet drained the life-blood from our souls. Religion still holds us in her firm grasp or her gentle embrace. Our educated men are not yet atheistic, as is so largely and sadly the case with educated men on the continent of Europe. Still we are fearfully exposed to materialism; and even our religion is too often hard, ungenial, unlovely, a matter of conscience more than of feeling, of fear more than of love, of dogma more than of sentiment. It is more inclined to express itself in creeds than in chants, in denunciations than in pleadings. It would be far more effective if it would only add grace to truth, and clothe the skeleton of doctrine in the flesh and blood without which a body even of divinity is impossible. The people of the South of Europe have imagination with too little reason; we have reason with too little imagination. It is plain what each needs, and this book aims to put us upon the right track for supplying our need. Mr. Jarves has enjoyed the best opportunities for the education of artistic taste, and brought to the study of the grand masterpieces of art an excellent natural aptitude. A loving student of nature from boyhood, a wide traveller, a very receptive man, and for many years a resident in the chosen seats of architecture, painting, and sculpture, his word is with authority. There are details of criticism in the work, about the accuracy of which we are not competent judges; but we are confident that we do not over-estimate its general value. In one or two instances we notice a slight carelessness in the construction of the sentences, as in the paragraph near the foot of the thirty-ninth page, and a little vagueness in the use of terms; as, for example, in the employment of the word "theoretic." Occasionally, too, the function of Beauty as a mediator between the soul and the highest truth is set forth without a sufficient acknowledgment, in word, of the One Mediator; we say in word, because this one mediation is all along taken for granted. A very few hours spent in revision before the second edition shall be demanded will remove these slight blemishes, if we are right in so regarding them.

*Which: the Right, or the Left.* New York: Garrett & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 536.

THE plan of this book is stated in a few curt sentences of the short preface. The author's theory is, that there are two Churches in the world, — the Church of Christ, which is a church of goodness, is "productive of gentleness, humility, and single-heartedness, and leads its people to happiness," — and the Church of Society, "which is a church of evil, is productive of pride, arrogance, and selfishness, and leads its people to misery." These two Churches are set in contrast in the familiar story of a young man who goes from his home in the country to be clerk in a New York dry-goods jobbing-house. The character of the young man is well drawn, and consistently sustained. He goes from home a Christian, and he comes back at last to die in his father's house a Christian death, after a faithful service and a heroic endurance in the cause of his Master. We have no fault to find with "Samuel." He is better than his theology.

Some of the other characters, too, are true to life. There are undoubtedly a good many such merchants as John P. Townsend, who value religion, virtue, honesty, frankness, and decency as good *paying* qualities, whose piety is a calculation of the main chance, and whose Christianity is a commercial speculation. There are not a few such precious villains as "the confidential clerk," who love by nature the popular forms of hypocrisy and depravity. There are cynics like Mr. Chittenden, "the silent partner," proud beauties, like the detestable Isabella, and rather weak angels, like good little Miriam, to be met with in every society. The machinery and side details of the story are not altogether improbable. We are assured by one familiar with the secrets of the traffic, that the picture of those thirteen clerks in John P. Townsend's great establishment, each a cheat in his own particular way, is not very much overdrawn, and that the language of the craft is exceedingly well given. The domestic life, too, of the great proprietor, is about an average specimen of what is found in the houses of those pious tradesmen who reconcile so nicely the service of Mammon with the patronage of God. We trust, however, that the description of the Rev. Mr. Engold's church, "a fashionable church," with a "fashionable preacher," is not to be taken as characteristic of the churches of his order generally. If it be, we should think the sarcasms of Mr. Griscom on the subject of fashionable piety not very much out of the way.

The scene at the party, the "*converzazione*," bating extravagance and bad spelling, is amusing and graphic. We know what the "Satanic Chuckle" newspaper is, what sort of man is



Ruffin, "proprietor of Ruffin's ale," and who are the respectable "Sly Slocum," publishers of the books which *sell*. Mr. Jessup, the cotton-broker, and Mr. Shellwick, the "straw-watcher," are acquaintances of ours, to be met on Wall Street any fair morning. These special sketches show the author's power, and show that he knows what he is talking about. The "revival" is got up rather hurriedly, makes headway too fast; but the narrative thereof shows that the author has had some experience in that line.

As a work of art, the book is a failure. The plot is clumsily managed, and the love-story has not a particle of interest. The deaths are conveniently but not gracefully brought in, and the lights and shades of the tale are grotesquely intermingled, so as to leave a picture about as pleasant to look upon as an ordinary country barn-yard, or a city street in hot weather. The canons of good taste are violated in the most free and easy way, and in every chapter. All the benevolence of the pious laundress cannot bring us to tolerate her "rip-dip-dippy" melodies. The constant application of the term "Prince" to Jesus is Scriptural, no doubt, but is not the common or the best word to describe his office with men. We are accustomed in this latitude to hear about our "Saviour," our "Master," our "Lord," but not about our "Prince."

As an exposition of social ethics and an illustration of practical Christian virtue, the book is better. It leaves the impression that honesty is the best policy, that uprightness will in the end win respect, that it is possible to overcome even the hardest temptations, and that the sure wages of sin are suffering and spiritual death. The morality of the volume is sound and earnest.

The theology of the book is interpolated, and has nothing to do with the progress of the story or its moral impression. There is not much of it, and it might, without any loss, be left out in a second edition.

---

*Wealth and Beauty. A Poem read before the Phi Beta Kappa Society in Cambridge, July 19th, 1855.* By WILLIAM HENRY HURLBUT. Cambridge: John Bartlett. 1855. pp. 31.

WE are glad to see this poem in print for two reasons. The first is, that it is among the most wealthy and beautiful which our classic festival has called out, — opulent in its full stores of scholarly allusion, and lovely in its robes of colored fancies and the voice of a sweetly poetic diction. It is truly a poem; thought out and expressed with the delicate taste, the high cul-

ture, and the fervid heart of one whom the Muse seems to love. Our second reason is, that it was in a great degree lost to the audience through a want of elocutionary power in its delivery ; and it would have been an injustice, if a performance of such sterling worth had left no impression beyond that of the day which it helped to celebrate. We hope it will find the more readers for having reached rather faintly the ears of those who first listened to it.

---

*Glaucus, or the Wonders of the Shore.* By CHARLES KINGSLEY. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1855. 16mo. pp. 165.

A delightful book for summer sea-side reading,—at once learned and popular,—full of fresh, sparkling sentences, which relieve the abundant scientific terms of their provoking hardness. The name "Glaucus" pleasantly recalls that old classic fable told by Pausanias of the Bœotian fisherman, who became a god by his lucky eating of the divine plant sown by Chronos, and visited afterwards all the coasts and islands of Greece, with his train of monstrous attendants, the protector of all who do business in the waters. No one will suspect Mr. Kingsley of more love for science than what may help a poet's fancy and an artist's dream. The erudition of the book is confessedly borrowed. But it will stimulate thought, show how to observe, and possibly aid to improve some of the lazy hours which belong to summer recreation. The chief defect in the volume which we notice is, that it has no points of rest, and is all in a single chapter. We should have been glad, too, to have had more about the real vegetable life of the sea-side, even with the loss of some of the mollusks, polypi, and sea-urchins, which are interesting to a much smaller class of naturalists.

---

*Waikna: or, Adventures on the Mosquito Shore.* By SAMUEL A. BARD. With Sixty Illustrations. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1855. 12mo. pp. 366.

FROM the lively style of the etchings and the playful spirit of the Introduction, this volume seemed a pastime for a holiday : but, as we proceeded in the free-hearted story of hairbreadth escapes, of deadly contests with wild beasts and wilder savages, of shipwreck and starvation, of exhausting labor and more exhausting disease, it became impossible to lay the book down until the half-year's roaming ended upon the threshold of civilized life.

Bating the unpardonable omission of dates and numbers, not in this case easily supplied by descriptions of that Caribbean coast, and the lack of any higher purpose than kindling his artistic imagination by pictures of tropical nature, Mr. Bard has given a narrative as interesting as Robinson Crusoe's, of an experience far more eventful. His fights with native tribes, towards whom he manifests a general spirit of humanity, diversify the narrative of midnight forays among the turtles, or fearful contests with the walrus. Judged from his own book, besides remarkable powers of endurance and a wonderful spirit of adaptation, our artist-voyager is gifted with the greatest persistency, love of adventure, and self-reliance. He luxuriates in hardships, and feasts with unsated appetite upon peril. Most of the time he is beyond the protection, succor, or sympathy of a single civilized man, assailed by bloodthirsty savages, surrounded by an inaccessible forest during the rainy season, completely hemmed in by wild hogs, or prostrated by the fever of the climate, with no companions save two native lads: and yet he abandons this forlorn swamp with seeming regret, and the sympathizing reader would have been gratified by another chapter of life from the tropical wilderness.

The whole region of his adventures, the eastern coast of Central America between Cape Gracias and Bluefield Lagoon, a distance of two hundred miles, is too miserable a country ever to be "settled" until the rest of the earth is crowded, and is admirably adapted to the slavers and pirates, its original occupants. The Mosquito Indians seem as wretched as their country, a mixed medley of "negroes, Indians, pirates, and Jamaica traders." A more ridiculous sham than their sovereign has not been contrived by politicians in recent times. The present king's commencing his reign by annulling the grants of his predecessor because of his drunkenness, and playing the puppet himself to an English official at Bluefields, are significant facts. If the report of native proficiency in vice given by this apparently favorable observer be correct, little is to be hoped from the Lagoon kingdom besides the gradual extinction of all the Mosquitos.

## INTELLIGENCE.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Of that all-engrossing theme, the European War, two volumes now before us afford in brief compass the most lucid and interesting accounts. Under the title of "A Visit to the Camp before Sebastopol," Messrs. Appleton & Co. have published a work by Richard C. McCormick, Jr., of New York, which, in concise but graphic and spirited narrative, and with some admirable engravings, presents us a perfect *résumé* of this momentous strife. Under the title of "The Story of the Campaign: a Complete Narrative of the War in Russia, written in a Tent in the Crimea," Messrs. Gould and Lincoln give us a reprint of an English work by Major E. Bruce Hawley, in which the reader has an intensely exciting sketch of events, with descriptions of the localities, and a candid discussion of the conduct of the War.

A cursory examination of two works which we have received too late for careful perusal and extended notice in our crowded space, leads us to reserve them for future attention. They are a volume published by Messrs. Gould and Lincoln, entitled "The Christian Life, Social and Individual, by Peter Bayne, M. A.," — the author of which is a Scotchman, who aims in these pages to present the positive necessity and value of a Christian basis and culture for heart and life; and a volume published by Messrs. J. P. Jewett & Co. from the pen of President Mahan, which, under the title of "Modern Mysteries Explained and Exposed," deals with the real and the supposititious phenomena of so-called Spiritualism.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. have published a work by Professor Guillaume H. Talbot, a distinguished teacher of French, entitled "French Translation Self-taught; or, First Book on French Translation." The system adopted in this volume is founded on the author's own experience in teaching, which fully qualifies him to present a method best suited to facilitate the efforts of the pupil. By notes defining the rules of syntax and pronunciation, by interlining French with the corresponding English terms, by giving interesting extracts in prose and poetry, and by all the other approved helps, the author leaves for the pupil his own portion of the task as easy of performance as the case will admit.

A promised volume, the publication of which has been waited for with high-raised expectations, is published only in season to allow of this mention of the fact in our closing sheet. It is from the pen of the Rev. C. A. Bartol, and bears the title of "Pictures of Europe framed in Ideas," published by Crosby, Nichols, & Co. The rich mind of the author, with all its power of conception and beauty in the form of utterance, needs only to be engaged upon such suggestions as must have entered it on his recent European tour, to insure for us a volume of exquisite grace and of the most instructive wisdom.



The same publishers will very soon issue a small devotional work, which has recently been commended both in England and in this country as worthy to contest the place held by "The Imitation of Christ." Its title is "Theologica Germanica." It claims to have been edited from a manuscript five hundred years old, by Pfeiffer, translated from the German, with an introduction by Susanna Winkworth, and indorsed by the warmest encomiums of the Rev. Charles Kingsley and Chevalier Bunsen.

---

The same firm have published a second and much improved edition of Mr. William S. Russell's "Pilgrim Memorials, and Guide to Plymouth. With a Lithographic Map, and Eight Copperplate Engravings." The volume gives authentic information concerning persons, events, and localities, which will have a deeper interest and be asked about by an increasing curiosity with each advancing year of time.

---

If the Memoirs and Letters of the Rev. Sydney Smith, just published by the Messrs. Harper, afford us the gratification which we have promised ourselves from their perusal, we shall have something to say of them in our next number.

---

The Messrs. Harper have just published an American reprint, edited by Dr. M'Clintock, of the second London edition of the English translation of the "History of the Council of Trent," from the French of L. F. Bungener. No recently published works have been received with greater favor among us than "The Preacher and the King," and "The Priest and the Huguenot," by the same admirable writer, and therefore we look for a well-wrought narrative in this volume.

---

The same publishers give us a small volume from the pen of Catharine E. Beecher, containing "Letters to the People on Health and Happiness." Valuable information, conveyed with clear good sense and in intelligible language, on topics which concern the comfort and virtue of households and of individuals, will be found abundantly spread over these pages.

---

Messrs. Gould and Lincoln have published a second edition of Dr. Sears's Revision of Roget's Thesaurus, of which we have already written in high terms. This edition contains additions and improvements.

---

Mr. Charles B. Norton, of New York, has published a calm and earnest essay on "The Unholy Alliance; an American View of the War in the East," by William Giles Dix. We hope that the contents of this volume will fall under the eyes of some of the English journalists who have complained of our lack of sympathy in the existing war.

---

#### RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Theological School at Cambridge.* — The usual Anniversary Exercises of this institution were all of them of peculiar interest this year, and the attendants upon them, who identify with them some of their most cher-

ished religious feelings, were numerous and were heartily gratified. On Sunday evening, July 15, the Sermon before the members of the Graduating Class was delivered by the Rev. George W. Briggs, of Salem, and has since been published by Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. The Thirty-ninth Annual Visitation of the School took place on Tuesday, July 17. The exercises having been opened with prayer by the Rev. Professor Francis, dissertations on the following topics were read by their respective authors, two only of the thirteen being necessarily excused.

Love and Fear as Principles of the Religious Life. — Mr. Andrew Napoleon Adams.

Image-Worship. — Mr. George Franklin Allen.

Has Christianity done for the World what might reasonably have been expected from it? — Mr. Charles Taylor Canfield.

The Sonship of Christ. — Mr. William Thomas Crapster.

What is it to preach Christ? — Mr. Simeon Borden Durfee.

The Holy Catholic Church. — Mr. Frederick Frothingham.

The Priest and the Prophet. — Mr. Edward Henry Hall.

The Lyceum and the Pulpit. — Mr. George Hughes Hepworth.

St. Paul at Athens. — Mr. William Lincoln Jenkins.

St. John's Type of the Christian Life. — Mr. Alfred Porter Putnam.

The Authority and Meaning of the Lord's Supper. — Mr. Theodore Tebbets.

The true Theory of Worship. — Mr. Charles Briggs Thomas.

The Characteristics of the Theology of Schleiermacher. — Mr. Asa Messer Williams.

The exercises were closed by prayer, by Professor Noyes.

After a fully attended business meeting of the Alumni in the afternoon, at which the President of the Association, the Rev. Dr. Gannett, filled the chair, and the officers of the last year were re-elected, the Rev Dr. Hedge, of Providence, being chosen Second Preacher for the next year, the Annual Discourse was delivered by the Rev. Dr. Eliot, of St. Louis. His subject was well expressed in his text, — "I magnify mine office." The Discourse has been published by Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co.

---

#### ERRATA.

Page 221, line 37, for "inverted," read "invented."

" 231, " 7, " "When," " "Then."